Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 5037 .W3 1811 v.2
Warburton, William, 1698-
1779.
The works of the Right
Reverend William Warburton.

Shelf

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/worksofrightreve02warb_0

THE

WORKS

OF THE

RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM WARBURTON, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

A NEW EDITION,

IN TWELVE VOLUMES.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

A DISCOURSE BY WAY OF GENERAL PREFACE:

CONTAINING

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE, WRITINGS, AND CHARACTER OF THE AUTHOR;

BY RICHARD HURD, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

VOLUME THE SECOND.

London:

Printed by Luke Hansard & Sons, near Lincoln's-Inn Fields,

FOR T. CADELL AND W. DAVIES, IN THE STRAND.

1811.

CONTENTS

OF

VOL. II.

THE DIVINE LEGATION.

BOOK II.

PROVES THE NECESSITY OF THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE TO SOCIETY, FROM THE CONDUCT OF THE ANCIENT LAWGIVERS, AND FOUNDERS OF CIVIL POLICY:

—continued.—

SECT. IV. The next art was the legislator's invention of the *mysteries*, solely instituted for the propagation and support of the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. Their original and progress deduced: their nature and end explained: their *secrets* revealed: and the causes of the degeneracy accounted for. To give a complete idea of this important institution, the sixth book of *Virgil* is examined, and the descent of *Æneas* into hell, shewn to be only an initiation into, and representation of the shows of the *mysteries*, pp. 1—210

APPENDIX - - - - - - pp. 211—263

SECT. V. The next instance of the magistrate's care of religion, in establishing a national worship. That an *established religion* is the universal voice of nature. The right of establishing a religion justified, in an explanation of

of the true theory of the *union between Chu and State*. This theory applied as a rule to judge the actual *establishments* in the *pagan* world. The uses that facilitated the establishment of religion amongst them; as likewise those causes that hindered the *establishments* from receiving their due form, pp. 262–298

SECT. VI. The last instance of the magistrate's care for the support of religion; in the allowance of a general *toleration*: the measure and causes of it: the nature of the ancient *tolerated* religions: how, under the supervision and direction of the magistrate: and how first violated and destroyed by civil tyranny - pp. 298–334

NOTES to Fourth, Fifth, & Sixth Sections - pp. 335–370

THE

DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES

DEMONSTRATED.

BOOK II.

CONTINUED.

SECT. IV.

THE NEXT step the Legislator took, was to support and affirm the general doctrine of a PROVIDENCE, which he had delivered in his laws, by a very circumstantial and popular method of inculcating the belief of a *future state of rewards and punishments.*

This was by the institution of the MYSTERIES, the most sacred part of pagan Religion; and artfully framed to strike deeply and forcibly into the minds and imaginations of the people.

I propose, therefore, to give a full and distinct account of this whole matter: and the rather, because it is a thing little known or attended to: the Ancients, who wrote expressly on the *Mysteries*, such as Melanthius, Menander, Hicesius, Sotades, and others, not being come down to us. So that the modern writers on this subject are altogether in the dark concerning

their origine and end; not excepting Meursius himself: to whom, however, I am much indebted, for abridging my labour in the search of those passages of antiquity, which make mention of the ELEUSINIAN *Mysteries*, and for bringing the greater part of them together under one view*.

To avoid ambiguity, it will be proper to explain the term. Each of the *pagan* Gods had (besides the *publick* and *open)* a *secret worship* † paid unto him: to which none were admitted but those who had been selected by preparatory ceremonies, called INITIATION. This *secret worship* was termed the MYSTERIES.

But though every God had, besides his *open* worship, the *secret* likewise; yet this latter did not *every where* attend the former; but only *there*, where he was the patron God, or in principal esteem. Thus, when in consequence of that intercommunity of paganism, which will be explained hereafter, one nation adopted the Gods of another, they did not always take in at the same time, the *secret worship* or *Mysteries* of that God: so, in Rome, the publick and open worship of Bacchus was in use long before his *Mysteries* were admitted. But, on the other hand again, the worship of the strange God was sometimes introduced only for the sake of his *Mysteries:* as, in the same city, that of Isis and Osiris. Thus stood the case in general; the particular exceptions to it, will be seen in the sequel of this dissertation.

* Eleusinia: sive de Cereris Eleusinæ sacro.

† Strabo, in his tenth book of his Geography, p. 716, Gron. ed. writes thus: Κοινὸν δὴ τοῦτο, καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐστὶ, τὸ τὰς ἱεροποιΐας μετὰ ἀνέσεως ἑορταστικῆς ποιεῖσθαι, τὰς μὲν σὺν ἐνθουσιασμῷ, τὰς δὲ χωρίς· καὶ ταῖς μὲν μετὰ μουσικῆς, τὰς δὲ μή· ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΜΕΝ ΜΥΣΤΙΚΩΣ, ΤΑΣ ΔΕ ΕΝ ΦΑΝΕΡΩι· καὶ τοῦτ' ἡ φύσις ἔστως ὑπαγορεύει.

The

The first and original *Mysteries*, of which we have any sure account, were those of Isis and Osiris in EGYPT; from whence they were derived to the GREEKS*, under the presidency of various Gods†, as the institutor thought most for his purpose: Zoroaster brought them into Persia: Cadmus and Inachus into Greece at large‡; Orpheus into Thrace: Melampus

* Diod. Sic. lib. i. Eudoxus said, as Plutarch informs us, that the Egyptians invented this fable concerning Jupiter Ammon, or the Supreme God,—That his Legs being unseparated, very shame drove him into solitude; but that Isis split and divided them, and by that means set him at liberty to walk about the World. Φησὶ περὶ τοῦ Διὸς ὁ Εὔδοξος, μυθολογεῖν Αἰγυπτίους, ὡς τῶν σκελῶν συμπεφυκότων αὐτῷ μὴ δυνάμενος βαδίζειν, ὑπ' αἰσχύνης, ἐρημία διέτριβεν. Ἡ δὲ Ἴσις διατεμοῦσα καὶ διασήσασα τὰ μέρη ταῦτα τοῦ σώματος, ἀρτίποδα, τὴν πορείαν παρέσχει. De Is. & Osir. Vol. I. pag. 670. Edit. Steph. 8vo. The moral of the fable is plainly this, as we shall see more plainly hereafter, That the FIRST CAUSE was kept unknown, till the Egyptian *Mysteries* of Isis revealed him amongst their ἀπόῤῥητα; which *Mysteries* were communicated to the Greeks, and, through them, to the rest of mankind. But the Image under which the fable is conveyed, was taken from the form of the Egyptian Statues of the Gods, which the workmen made with their Legs undivided. When the Greek Artists first shewed them how to form their Gods in a walking Posture, the attitude so alarmed their Worshippers, that they bound them with Chains, lest they should desert their own Country. For the people imagined that their Gods, on the least ill humour or disgust, had a strange propensity to shew them a fair pair of heels.

† Ὅτι δὲ τῶν Διονυσίων, καὶ τῶν Παναθηναίων, καὶ μέντοι τῶν Θεσμοφορίων, καὶ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων τὰς τελετὰς Ὀρφεὺς, ἀνὴρ Ὀδρύσης, εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐκόμισεν, καὶ εἰς ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΝ ἀφικόμενος, τὰ τῆς Ἴσιδος καὶ τοῦ Ὀσίριδος εἰς τὰ τῆς Δηοῦς καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου μεταλέθεικεν ὄργια. Theodoretus, Therapeut. i.

‡ Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀρχὴν ἴσχε τὰ παρ' Ἕλλησι μυστήριά τε καὶ τελεταί· πρότερον παρ' ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΟΙΣ, καὶ παρὰ Φρυξὶ, καὶ Φοινιξὶ, καὶ Βαβυλονίοις, κακῶς ἐπινενοημένα μεταχθέντα τε εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΩΝ χώρας ὑπὸ Κάδμου καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰνάχου. Ἀπίδος πρότερον κληθέντος, καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντος τὴν Μέμφιν· Epiphan. adv. Hær. lib. i. Hæres. iv.

into Argis; Trophonius into Bœotia; Minos into Crete; Cinyras into Cyprus; and Erechtheus into Athens. And as in Egypt they were to Isis and Osiris; so in Asia they were to Mithras; in Samothrace to the Mother of the Gods; in Bœotia to Bacchus; in Cyprus to Venus; in Crete to Jupiter; in Athens to Ceres and Proserpine; in Amphissa to Castor and Pollux; in Lemnos to Vulcan, and so to others, in other places, the number of which is incredible*.

But their end, as well as nature, was the same in all; to teach the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE. In this, Origen and Celsus agree; the two most learned writers of their several parties. The first, minding his adversary of the difference between the *future life* promised by the Gospel, and that taught in Paganism, bids him compare the Christian doctrine with what all the sects of Philosophy, and all the *Mysteries*, amongst Greeks and Barbarians, taught concerning it †: And Celsus, in his turn, endeavouring to shew that christianity had no advantage over paganism in the efficacy of stronger sanctions, expresses himself to this purpose: "But now, after all, just as you believe "eternal punishments, so do the Ministers of the "sacred rites, and those who initiate into, and preside "in the *Mysteries* ‡."

They

* Postulat quidem magnitudo materiæ, atque ipsius defensionis officium, ut similiter cæteras turpitudinum species persequamur: vel quas produnt antiquitatis historiæ, vel mysteria illa continent sacra, quibus initiis nomen est, & quæ non omnibus vulgo, sed paucorum taciturnitatibus tradi licet. Sed *Sacrorum innumeri ritus*, atque affixa deformitas singulis, corporaliter prohibet universa nos exequi. Arnob. adv. Gentes, lib. v. p. 165. Edit. Plantini, 8vo, 1582.

† —Καθ' ἑκάστην φιλοσόφων αἵρεσιν ἐν Ἕλλησιν ἢ Βάρβαροις ἢ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΔΗ. Orig. cont. Cels. lib. iii. p. 160. Sp. ed.

‡ Μάλιστα μὲν, ὦ βέλτιστε, ὥσπερ σὺ κολάσεις αἰωνίους νομίζεις· ὕτω καὶ οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκείνων ἐξηγηταὶ τελεσταί τε καὶ μυσταγωγοί, lib. viii. p. 408. And

that

They continued long in religious reverence: some were more famous and more extensive than others; to which many accidents concurred. The most noted were the ORPHIC, the BACCHIC, the ELEUSINIAN, the SAMOTHRACIAN, the CABIRIC, and the MITHRIAC.

Euripides makes Bacchus say, in his tragedy of that name*, that the *Orgies* were celebrated by all foreign nations, and that he came to introduce them amongst the Greeks. And it is not improbable, but several barbarous nations might have learned them of the Egyptians long before they came into Greece. The Druids of Britain, who had, as well as the Brachmans of India, divers of their religious rites from thence, celebrated the *Orgies* of Bacchus, as we learn from Dionysius the African. And Strabo having quoted Artemidorus for a fabulous story, subjoins, "But what "he says of Ceres and Proserpine is more credible, "namely, that there is an island near Britain, where "they perform the same rites to those two God-"desses as are used in Samothrace †." But, of all the MYSTERIES, those which bore that name, by way of eminence, the ELEUSINIAN, celebrated at Athens in

that nothing very heterodox was taught in the mysteries concerning a future state, I collect from the answer Origen makes to Celsus, who had preferred what was taught in the Mysteries of Bacchus on that point, to what the Christian Religion revealed concerning it—περὶ μὲν ὧν τῶν Βακχικῶν τελεῖῶν εἴτε τίς ἐστι πιθανὸς λόγος, εἴτε μηδεὶς τοιοῦτος—lib. iv. p. 167.

* Act. II.

† Περὶ δὲ τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ τῆς κόρης πιστότερα· ὅτι φησὶν εἶναι νῆσον πρὸς τῇ Βρεττανικῇ, καθ' ἣν ὅμοια τοῖς ἐν Σαμοθρᾴκῃ περὶ τὴν Δήμητραν καὶ τὴν Κόρην ἱεροποιεῖται. Strabonis Geogr. lib. iv. p. 137. lin. 26. Edit. Casaub. The nature of these Samothracian rites is explained afterwards.

in honour of Ceres, were by far the most renowned; and, in course of time, eclipsed, and almost swallowed up the rest. Their neighbours round about very early practised these *Mysteries* to the neglect of their own: in a little time all Greece and Asia Minor were initiated into them: and at length they spread over the whole Roman empire, and even beyond the limits of it. "I insist not," says Tully, "on those sacred "and august rites of ELEUSIS, where, from the re-"motest regions, men came to be initiated *." And we are told in Zosimus, that "these most holy rites "were then so extensive, as to take in the whole "race of mankind †." Aristides calls Eleusis, *the common temple of the earth* ‡. And Pausanias says, the rites performed there for the promotion of piety and virtue, as much excelled all other rites, as the Gods excelled the Heroes §.

How this happened, the nature and turn of the People, who introduced these *Mysteries*, will account for. Athens was a city the most devoted to Religion of any upon the face of the earth. On this account their poet Sophocles calls it *the sacred building of the Gods* ||, his figure of speech alluding to its fabulous

* Omitto ELEUSINAM sanctam illam & augustam: ubi initiantur gentes orarum ultimæ. Nat. Deor. lib. i. c. 42. Edit. Ox. 4°. T. ii. p. 432.

† Τὰ συνέχοντο τὸ ἀνθρώπειον μένος ἁγιώτατα μυστήρια. lib. iv.

‡ Ὅστις ἐ κοινόν τι τῆς γῆς τέμενος τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα ἡγεῖτο. Aristidis Eleusinia, in initio.

§ Οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαιότεροι τῶν Ἑλλήνων τελετὴν τὴν Ἐλευσινίαν πάντων ὁπόσα ἐς εὐσέβειαν ἥκει, τοσούτῳ ἦγον ἐντιμότεραν, ὅσω καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιπροσθὲν ἡρώων. Phocica, l. x. c. 31. p. 876. In this elegant similitude he seems plainly to allude to the *secret* of the *mysteries*; which, as we shall see, consisted in an explanation of the *origin of hero-worship*, and the *nature of the deity*.

|| Electra, act. ii. sc. 1. ΑΘΗΝΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΜΗΤΩΝ.—

foundation.

foundation. Nor was it a less compliment St. Paul intended to pay the Athenians, when he said, Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ*. And Josephus tells us, that *they were universally esteemed the most religious people of Greece* †. Hence, in these matters, Athens became the pattern and standard to the rest of the world.

In discoursing, therefore, of the MYSTERIES in general, we shall be forced to take our ideas of them chiefly from what we find practised in the *Eleusinian*. Nor need we fear to be mistaken; the END of all being the same, and all having their common ORIGINAL from Egypt.

To begin with the general purpose and design of their Institution. This will be understood, by shewing what they *communicated* promiscuously to all.

To support the doctrine of a PROVIDENCE, which, they taught, governed the world ‡, they inforced the belief of a FUTURE STATE of rewards and punishments §, by every sort of contrivance. But as this did not quite clear up the intricate ways of Providence, they added the doctrine of a METEMPSYCHOSIS, or the belief of a *prior state*: as we learn from Cicero, and Porphyry ‖; the latter of whom informs us, that it was taught in the *Mysteries* of the Persian Mithras.

* Act. Apost. xvii. 22.

† —εὐσεβεστάτους τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἅπαντες λέγουσιν. Cont. Ap. lib. ii. t. II. edit. Oxon. folio, 1720. cap. 15. pag. 1373. lin. 12.

‡ Plutarch. de Is. & Osir.

§ [Mysteriis] neque solum, &c.—Sed etiam cum SPE MELIORE MORIENDI. Tull. de Legg. lib. ii. c. 14. Edit. Ox. 4°. t. III. p. 148.

‖ Καὶ γὰρ δόγμα πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν πρώτων, τὴν ΜΕΤΕΜΨΥΧΩΣΙΝ εἶναι· ὃ καὶ ἐμφαίνειν ἐοίκασιν ἐν τοῖς τὰ Μίθρα μυστηρίοις. De Abst. lib. iv. §. 16. Edit. Cantabr. 1655. 8vo.

This was an ingenious solution, invented by the Egyptian Lawgivers, to remove all doubts concerning the moral attributes of God*; and so, by adding a *prior* to a *future state*, to establish the firm belief of his Providence. For the Lawgiver well knew how precarious that belief was, while the moral attributes of God remained doubtful and uncertain.

In cultivating the doctrine of a *future life*, it was taught, that the *Initiated* should be happier in that state than all other mortals: that while the souls of the profane, at their leaving the body, stuck fast in mire and filth, and remained in darkness, the souls of the *Initiated* winged their flight directly to the happy islands, and the habitations of the Gods†. This doctrine was as necessary for the support of the *Mysteries*, as the *Mysteries* were for the support of the doctrine. But now, lest it should be mistaken, that *initiation* alone, or any other means than a virtuous life, intitled men to this future happiness, the *Mysteries* openly proclaimed it as their chief business, to restore the soul to its original purity. "It "was the end and design of *initiation*," says Plato, "to restore the soul to that state, from whence it fell, "as from its native seat of perfection‡." They

* So Tully. Ex quibus humanæ vitæ erroribus & ærumnis sit, ut interdum veteres illi sive vates, sive in sacris INITIISQUE tradendis divinæ mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua scelera suscepta in vitâ superiore, pœnarum luendarum caussa, natos esse dixerunt, aliquid vidisse videantur. Fragm. ex. lib. de Philosophia.

† Plato in Phædone, p. 69. C. p. 81. A. t. I. Edit. Henr. Stephani.—Aristides Eleusiniâ, t. I. p. 454. Edit Canteri, 8vo. & apud Stobæum, Serm. 119, &c. Schol. Arist. in Ranis. Diog. Laert. in vita Diog. Cynici.

‡ Σκοπὸς τῶν τελετῶν ἐστιν, εἰς τέλος ἀναλαγεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκεῖνο ἀφ' ἧς τὴν πρώτην ἐποιήσαντο κάθοδον, ὡς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. In Phædone.

contrived

contrived that every thing should tend to shew the necessity of virtue; as appears from Epictetus:— "Thus the *Mysteries* become useful; thus we seize "the true spirit of them; when we begin to ap- "prehend that every thing therein was instituted by "the Ancients, for instruction and amendment of "life*." Porphyry gives us some of those moral precepts, which were inforced in the Mysteries, as *to honour their parents, to offer up fruits to the Gods, and to forbear cruelty towards animals* †. For the accomplishment of this purpose, it was required in the *Aspirant* to the Mysteries, that he should be of a clear and unblemished Character, and free even from the suspicion of any notorious crime ‡. To come at the truth of his Character, he was severely interrogated by the Priest or Hierophant, impressing on him the same sense of obligation to conceal nothing, as is now done at the Roman Confessional §. Hence it was, that when Nero, after the murder of his

* Οὕτως ὠφέλιμα γίνεται τὰ μυςήρια· ὅτως εἰς φαντασίαν ἐρχόμεθα· ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδιᾷ καὶ ἐπανορθώσει τοῦ βίου κατεςάθη πάντα ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν. Apud Arrian. Dissert. lib. iii. cap. 21. My reason for translating εἰς φαντασίαν in this manner, was, because I imagined the author, in this obscure expression, alluded to the custom in the Mysteries of calling those who were initiated only in the lesser, Μύςαι; but those, in the greater, Ἐπόπται.

† Γονεῖς τιμᾷν, Θεοὺς καρποῖς ἀγάλλειν, ζῶα μὴ σίνεσθαι. De Abst. lib. iv. §. 22. Edit. Cant. 1655. 8vo.

‡ Οὗτοι γὰρ τά τ' ἄλλα καθαροῖς εἶναι τοῖς μύςαις ἐν κοινῷ προαγορεύουσιν, οἷον τὰς χεῖρας τὴν ψυχὴν—εἶναι. Libanius Decl. xix. p. 495. D. Edit. Morelli, fol. 1606.

§ As appears from the repartee which Plutarch records, in his Laconic apophthegms of Lysander, Edit. Francof. 1599. t. II. p. 229. D. when he went to be initiated into the Samothracian mysteries; Ἐν δὲ Σαμοθράκῃ χρηςηριαζομένῳ αὐτῷ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκέλευσεν εἰπεῖν ὅ, τί ἀνομώτατον ἔργον αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βίῳ πέπρακται; ποτερον οὖν σοῦ τοῦτο

his mother, took a journey into Greece, and had a mind to be present at the celebration of the *Eleusinian Mysteries*, the conscience of his parricide deterred him from attempting it *. On the same account, the good emperor M. Antoninus, when he would purge himself to the world of the death of Avidius Cassius, chose to be initiated into the *Eleusinian Mysteries* †; it being notorious, that none were admitted into them, who laboured under the just suspicion of any heinous immorality. And Philostratus tells us, that Apollonius was desirous of being initiated in these *Mysteries*; but that the Hierophant refused to admit him, because he esteemed the Aspirant to be no better than a Magician: for the *Eleusinian* stood open to none who did not approach the Gods with a pure and holy worship ‡. This was, originally, an indispensable condition of *initiation*, observed in common, by all the Mysteries; and instituted by Bacchus, or Osiris himself, the first inventer of them; who, as Diodorus tells us, initiated none but pious and virtuous men §. During the *celebration* of the Mysteries,

τοῦτο κελεύσαντος ἢ τῶν θεῶν, τοῦτο δεῖ ποιεῖν; ἐπηρώτησε. Φαμενόν δὲ, τῶν θεῶν, Σὺ τοίνυν, ἔφη, ἐκποδὼν μὲν κατάστηθι, κἀκείνοις ἐρῶ ἐὰν συνθάνωσι—Why initiation into these Mysteries is called, enquiring of the oracle, will be seen afterwards.

* Peregrinatione quidem Græciæ, Eleusiniis sacris, quorum initiatione impii & scelerati voce præconis submoverentur, interesse non ausus est. Sueton. Vita Neron. capt. 34. § 12. Edit. Pitisci.

† Jul. Capit. Vita Ant. Phil. and Dion Cass.

‡ Ὁ δὲ ἱεροφάντης οὐκ ἐβούλετο παρέχειν τὰ ἱερὰ, μὴ γὰρ ἂν ποτε μυῆσαι γόητα· μὴ δὲ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα ἀνοῖξαι ἀνθρώπῳ μὴ καθαρῷ τὰ δαιμόνια. De Vita Apollonii Tyanensis, l. iv. c. 18. Edit. Olearii, fol.

§ —καλὰ δείξαι δὲ κ᾽ τὰ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς, κ᾽ μεταδοῦναι τῶν μυστηρίων τοῖς εὐσεβέσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων κ᾽ δίκαιον βίον ἀσκοῦσι. Lib. iii. p. 138. St. ed.

teries, they were enjoined the greatest sanctity, and highest elevation of mind. " When you sacrifice or " pray (says Epictetus in Arrian) go with a prepared " purity of mind, and with dispositions so previously " ordered, as are required of you when you approach " the ancient *rites and Mysteries**." And Proclus tells us that the Mysteries and the Initiations drew the souls of men from a material, sensual, and merely human life, and joined them in *communion* with the Gods †. Nor was a less degree of purity required of the Initiated for their *future* conduct ‡. They were obliged by solemn engagements to commence a new life of strictest piety and virtue; into which they were entered by a severe course of penance, proper to purge the mind of its natural defilements. Gregory Nazianzen tells us, that " no one " could be initiated into the *Mysteries of Mithras*, till " he had undergone all sorts of mortifying trials, and " had approved himself holy and impassible §." The consideration of all this made Tertullian say, that, in the *Mysteries*, " Truth herself took on every " shape, to oppose and combat Truth ‖." And St. Austin, " That the devil hurried away deluded souls

* Καὶ μετὰ θυσίας δὲ, καὶ μετ' εὐχῶν, καὶ προηγνευκότα, καὶ προδιακείμενον τῇ γνώμῃ, ὅτι ἱεροῖς προσελεύσεται καὶ ἱεροῖς παλαιοῖς. Arrian. Dissert. lib. iii. cap. 21.

† Τά τε μυστήρια καὶ τὰς τελετὰς ἀνάγειν μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνύλου καὶ θνητοειδοῦς ζωῆς τὰς ψυχὰς, καὶ συνάπτειν τοῖς θεοῖς. In Remp. Plat. lib. i.

‡ Καὶ τῶν μυστηρίων ἀξιουθεὶς ἐδεόμην καὶ τῆς παρ' ὑμῶν ἁγίστης παιδεύσεως. Quidam apud Sopatrum, in Div. Quæst.

§ ἐδεὶς δὲ δύνασθαι τελεῖσθαι τὰς τοῦ Μίτρου τελετὰς, εἰ μὴ διὰ πασῶν τῶν κολάσεων παρέλθοι, καὶ δείξει ἑαυτὸν ἀπαθῆ καὶ ὅσιον. 1 Orat. cont. Julian.

‖ Omnia adversus veritatem, de ipsa veritate constructa sunt. Apol. cap. 47.

" to

" to their destruction, when he promised to *purify* " them by those ceremonies, called INITIATIONS*."

The *initiated*, under this discipline, and with these promises, were esteemed the only happy amongst men. Aristophanes, who speaks the sense of the people, makes them exult and triumph after this manner: " On us only does the sun dispense his " blessings; we only receive pleasure from his beams: " we, who are *initiated*, and perform towards citizens " and strangers all acts of piety and justice †." And Sophocles, to the same purpose, " LIFE, only is " to be had there: all other places are full of misery " and evil ‡." " Happy (says Euripides) is the man " who hath been initiated into the greater *Mysteries*, " and leads a life of piety and religion §." And the longer any one had been *initiated*, the more honourable was he deemed ‖. It was even scandalous not to be initiated: and however virtuous the person otherwise appeared, he became suspicious to the people: As was the case of Socrates, and, in after-

* Diabolum—animas deceptas illusasque præcipitasse—quum polliceretur purgationem animæ per eas, quas ΤΕΛΕΤΑΣ appellant. De Trinitate, lib. iv. c. 10.

† Μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἥλιος
Καὶ φέγγος ἱλαρόν ἐστιν,
Ὅσοι μεμυήμεθ', εὐ-
σεβῆ τε διήγομεν
Τρόπον, περί τε ξένους
Καὶ τοὺς ἰδιώτας. Chorus in Ranis, act. 1. in fine.

‡ - - - - Τοῖς δὲ μόνοις ἐκεῖ
Ζῆν ἐστι· τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἐκεῖ κακά.

§ Ὦ μάκαρ ὅστις εὐδαίμων τελεῖται θεῶν
Εἰδὼς, βιοτὰν ἁγιστεύει. Bacch.

‖ Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀμύητος μύστης ἀτιμότερος τοῦ πάλαι μύστου. Aristidis in Orat. περὶ παραφθέγματος.

times,

times, of Demonax *. No wonder, then, if the superior advantages of the *Initiated*, both here and hereafter, should make the *Mysteries* universally aspired to. And, indeed, they soon grew as comprehensive in the numbers they embraced, as in the regions and countries to which they extended: men, women, and children ran to be initiated. Thus Apuleius † describes the state of the Mysteries even in his time: "Influunt turbæ, sacris divinis initiatæ, viri "fœminæque, omnis ætatis & omnis dignitatis." The Pagans, we see, seemed to think *initiation* as necessary, as the Christians did *baptism*. And the custom of initiating children appears from a passage of Terence ‡, to have been general.

"Ferietur alio munere, ubi hera pepererit;
"Porro autem alio, ubi erit puero natalis dies,
"Ubi INITIABUNT."

Nay they had even the same superstition in the administration of it, which some Christians had of Baptism, to defer it till the approach of death; so the honest farmer Trygæus, in the *Pax* of Aristophanes:

Δεῖ γὰρ μυηθῆναί με πρὶν τεθνηκέναι.

The occasion of this solicitude is told us by the scholiast on the *Ranæ* of the same poet. "The "Athenians believed, that he who was initiated, and "instructed in the *Mysteries*, would obtain celestial

* Lucian. Vit. Dem. t. II. p. 374, et seq. Edit. Reitzii, 4°. Amstel. 1743.

† Met. lib. xi. pag. 959. Edit. Lugd. 1587, 8vo.

‡ Phorm. act. i. sc. i. And Donatus, on the place, tells us, the same custom prevailed in the Samothracian mysteries: "Teren-"tius Apollodorum sequitur, apud quem legitur, in insula Samo-"thracum à certo tempore pueros initiari, more Atheniensium."

"honour

" honour after death: and THEREFORE all ran to " be initiated *." Their fondness for it became so great, that at such times as the publick Treasury was low, the Magistrates could have recourse to the *Mysteries*, as a fund to supply the exigencies of the State. " Aristogiton (says the commentator on Her- " mogenes) in a great scarcity of publick money, " procured a law, that in Athens every one should " pay a certain sum for his *initiation* †."

Every thing in these rites was mysteriously conducted, and under the most solemn obligations to secrecy ‡. Which how it could agree to our representation of the *Mysteries*, as an institution for the use of the people, we shall now endeavour to explain.

They were hidden and kept secret for two reasons:

I. Nothing excites our curiosity like that which retires from our observation, and seems to forbid

* Λόγος γὰρ ἐκράτει παρ' Ἀθηναίοις, ὡς ὁ τὰ μυστήρια διδαχθεὶς, μεῖζόν τὴν, ἐνθένδε τελευτὴν θείας ἠξιοῦτο τιμῆς· διὸ καὶ πάντες πρὸς τὴν μύησιν ἔσπευδον.

† Ἀριστογείτων ἐν σπάνει χρημάτων, γράφει νόμον, παρ' Ἀθηναίοις μισθῷ μυεῖσθαι. Syrianus.

‡ Cum ignotis hominibus Orpheus sacrorum ceremonias aperiret, nihil aliud ab his quos initiabat in primo vestibulo nisi jurisjurandi necessitatem, & cum terribili quadam auctoritate religionis, exegit, ne profanis auribus inventæ ac compositæ religionis secreta proderentur. Fermicus in limine lib. vii. Astronom. —Nota sunt hæc Græcæ superstitionis Hierophantis, quibus inviolabili lege interdictum erat, ne hæc atque hujusmodi Mysteria apud eos, qui his sacris minimè initiati essent, evulgarent. —Nicetas in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orat. εἰς τὰ ἅγια φῶτα. This obligation of the initiated to secrecy was the reason that the *Egyptian hieroglyphic* for them, was a grass-hopper, which was supposed to have no mouth. See Horapollo Hieroglyph. lib. ii. cap. 55. Edit. Pauw, 1727, 4to.

our

our search. Of this opinion we find the learned Synesius, where he says, "The people will despise "what is easy and intelligible, and therefore they "must always be provided with something wonderful "and mysterious in Religion, to hit their taste, and "stimulate their curiosity*." And again, "The "ignorance of the mysteries preserves their venera-"tion: for which reason they are entrusted only to "the cover of night†." "The veil or mist (says "Clemens Alex.) through which things are only "*permitted to be seen*, renders the truths contained "under it more venerable and majestick‡." On these principles the *Mysteries* were framed. They were kept secret, to excite curiosity: They were celebrated in the night, to impress veneration and religious horror§: And they were performed with variety of shews and representations (of which more hereafter) to fix and perpetuate these impressions‖. Hitherto, then, the *Mysteries* are to be considered as invented, not

* Τὸ δὲ ῥᾷστον καὶ γελάσεσθαι ὁ δῆμος· δεῖται γὰρ τερατείας. To the same purpose, Nicephorus Gregoras, Hist. lib. v. p. 72. Edit. Basil. fol. 1562. Τὰ γὰρ τοῖς πάσι προχειρα κόρον τε ἔσχε, καὶ ἀχρηστία σφίσιν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ περικέχυται.

† Ἀγνωσία σεμνότης ἐστὶ τελεῖων· καὶ νὺξ τοῦτο πιστεύεται τὰ μυστήρια. Libro de Providentia.

‡ Ἄλλως τε καὶ πάνυ ὅσα διὰ τίνος παρακαλύμματος ὑποφαίνεται, μείζονά τε καὶ σεμνοτέραν δεικνυσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Strom. L. v. pag. 419. lin. 3. Edit. Sylburgh.

§ Euripides, in the Bacchantes, act. ii. makes Bacchus say, that the orgies were celebrated in the night, because darkness has something solemn and august in it, and proper to fill the mind with sacred horror.

‖ Διὸ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἐν ΑΛΛΗΓΟΡΙΑΙΣ λέγεται, πρὸς ἔκπληξιν καὶ φρίκην, ὥσπερ ἐν ΣΚΟΤΩι, καὶ ΝΥΚΤΙ· ἔοικε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀλληγορία τῷ σκότῳ καὶ τῇ νυκτί. Demet. Phalereus de Elocutione, § 110.

to *deter*, but to *invite* the curiosity of the people. But,

II. They were kept secret from a necessity of teaching the Initiated some things, improper to be communicated to ALL. The learned Varro in a fragment of his book *Of Religions*, preserved by St. Augustin, tells us, that "There were many truths, "which it was inconvenient for the State to be gene- "rally known; and many things, which, though false, "it was expedient the People should believe; and "that therefore the Greeks shut up their MYSTERIES "in the silence of their sacred inclosures*."

Now to reconcile this seeming contradiction, in supposing the *Mysteries* to be instituted to invite the People into them, and, at the same time, to keep them from the People's knowledge, we are to observe, that in the *Eleusinian rites* there were two celebrations of the Mysteries, the GREATER and the LESS†. The end of the *less* must be referred to what we said of the Institutor's intention to invite the people into them; and of the *greater*, to his intention of keeping some truths from the people's knowledge. Nor is this said without sufficient warrant: Antiquity is very express for this distinction. We are told that the *lesser Mysteries* were only a kind of preparatory purification for the *Greater*‡, and might

* Multa esse vera, quæ vulgo scire non sit utile; multaque, quæ, tametsi falsa sint, aliter existimare populum expediat. Et ideo Græcos TELETAS ac MYSTERIA taciturnitate parietibusque clausisse. Civ. Dei, lib. iv. cap. 31.

† Ἦσαν τὰ μὲν μεγάλα τῆς Δήμητρος· τὰ δὲ μικρὰ Περσεφόνης τῆς αὐτῆς Θυγατρός. Interp. Græc. ad Plut. Aristophanis.

‡ Ἔστι τὰ μικρὰ ὥσπερ προκάθαρσις, καὶ προάγνευσις τῶν μεγάλων. Schol. ad Plut. secund. Aristoph.

be easily communicated to all*. That four years † was the usual time of probation for those *greater* Mysteries; in which (as Clemens Alexandrinus expressly informs us) the SECRETS were deposited ‡.

However, as it is very certain, that both the *greater* and *lesser* Mysteries were instituted for the benefit of the State, it follows, that the DOCTRINES taught in both, were equally for the service of Society; only with this difference; some without inconvenience might be taught promiscuously, others could not.

On the whole, the secret in the *lesser* Mysteries was principally contained in some hidden *rites and shews* to be kept from the open view of the people, only to invite their curiosity: And the secret in the *greater*, some hidden *doctrines* to be kept from the people's knowledge, for the very contrary purpose. For the *Shews* common both to the *greater* and *lesser mysteries*, were only designed to engage the attention, and raise their devotion.

But it may be worth while to enquire more particularly into the HIDDEN DOCTRINES of the *greater* Mysteries: for so religiously was the secret kept, that the thing seems still to lie involved in darkness. We shall, therefore, proceed cautiously; and try, from the obscure hints dropped up and down in Antiquity,

"Pandere res alta terra & caligine mersas."

* Ἐπενόησαν μυστήρια εὐμελιάδιλα. Schol. Aristoph.

† — Cùm epoptas ante quinquennium instituunt, ut opinionem suspendio cognitionis ædificent. Tertul. adv. Valentinianos, in initio.

‡ Μιλὰ ταῦτα δέ ἐστι τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια, διδασκαλίας τινὰ ὑπόθεσιν ἔχοντα, καὶ προπαρασκευὴν τῶν μελλόντων· τὰ δὲ μεγάλα περὶ τῶν συμπάντων ἐπ μανθάνειν ἔτι ὑπολείπεται, ἐποπτεύειν δὲ, καὶ περινοεῖν τὴν τε φύσιν, καὶ τὰ πράγματα. Strom. v. pag. 424. C. Edit. Sylburgii.

First, as to the general nature of these *hidden doctrines*, it appears, they must needs be such, which, if promiscuously taught, would bring prejudice to the State; Why else were they secreted? and, at the same time, benefit, if communicated with caution and prudence; Why else were they taught at all?

From their general nature, we come by degress to their particular. And first,

I. To the certain knowledge of what they were not: which is one step to the knowledge of what they were.

1. They were not the common doctrines of a Providence and future state; for ancient testimony is express, that these doctrines were taught promiscuously to all the initiated; and were of the very essence of these Rites—These doctrines were not capable of being hid and secreted, because they were of universal credit amongst the civilized part of mankind. There was no need to hide them; because the common knowledge of them was so far from being detrimental to Society, that, as we have shewn, Society could not even subsist without their being generally known and believed.

2. These secret doctrines could not be the metaphysical speculations of the Philosophers concerning the *Deity*, and the *human soul*. 1. Because this would be making the *hidden doctrines* of the *schools* of Philosophy, and of the *mysteries* of Religion, one and the same; which they could not be, because their ends were different: the end of pagan Philosophy being only Truth; the end of pagan Religion, only Utility. These indeed were their professed ends. But

Both being ignorant of this important verity, *That Truth and general Utility do coincide* *, they Both, in many cases, missed shamefully of their end. The Philosopher, while he neglected *utility*, falling into the most absurd and fatal errors concerning the nature of God and of the Soul †: And the Lawgiver, while so little solicitous of *truth*, encouraged a Polytheism very mischievous to Society. However, as we shall now see, he invented and successfully employed these *Mysteries* to remedy the disorders arising from it.—2. Because revealing such metaphysical speculations to the members of civil Society, with what caution soever, would be injurious to the State, and productive of no good to Religion; as will be seen when we come, in the third book, to examine what those metaphysical speculations were.—3. Because such speculations (as we shall then see) would overthrow every thing taught to ALL, in the *Mysteries*, concerning a Providence, and a future state: And yet we are told by the Ancients, that the doctrines of a Providence, and future state, were the FOUNDATION of the more *secret* ones, after which we are now enquiring.

I have been the more particular in refuting this notion, that the secret doctrines of the *Schools*, and of the *Mysteries*, might be the same; because I find it to be an error, into which some, even of the most knowing of the Ancients, were apt to fall. What misled them, was, 1. That the *Schools* and *Mysteries* both pretended *to restore the soul to its original purity and perfection.* We have seen how much the *Mysteries* pretended to it. As to the Philosophers, Porphyry, speaking of Pythagoras, tells us, that " he professed

* See B. III. Sect. 2. † See B. III. Sect. 4.

" philosophy, whose end is to free and vindicate the " soul from those chains and confinements, to which " its abode with us hath made it subject*." 2. That the Schools and Mysteries had each their *hidden* doctrines, which went under the common name of ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ; and that, which had a common name, was understood to have a common nature. 3. And chiefly, that the Philosopher and Lawgiver, being frequently in one and the same person, and, consequently, the Institutions of the *Mysteries* and the Schools established by the same hand, it appeared reasonable to think, that the ἀπόῤῥητα, in both, were the same; they not distinguishing the twofold character of the ancient Sage, which shall be explained hereafter †.

II. Having, from the discovery of the general end and purpose of these SECRETS, seen what they could not be, we shall now be enabled to find what, in fact, they were.

To begin with a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus. —" After these (namely, lustrations) are the LESSER " *Mysteries*, in which is laid the FOUNDATION of the " *hidden doctrines*, and preparations for what is to " come afterwards ‡." From a knowledge of the *foundation*, we may be able to form an idea of the

* Φιλοσοφίαν δ' ἐφιλοσόφησεν, ἧς ὁ σκοπὸς, ῥύσασθαι καὶ διελευθερῶσαι τῶν τοιούτων εἱρμῶν τε καὶ συνδέσμων τὸν καλακεχωρισμένον ἡμῖν νοῦν. De Vita Pythag. Edit. Cantabr. 1655, 8vo. pag. 201.

† See B. III. Sect. 2.

‡ Μετὰ ταῦτα δέ ἐστι τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια, διδασκαλίας τινὰ ὑπόθεσιν ἔχοντα, καὶ προπαρασκευὴς τῶν μελλόντων. Strom. v. pag. 424. Ἀγὼν γὰρ καὶ ὁ προάγων, καὶ μυστήρια τὰ πρὸ μυστηρίων. Strom. i. pag. 203. lin. 7. Edit. Sylburgh.

superstructure.

superstructure. This foundation (as hath been shewn) was the belief of a Providence, and future state; and, its consequence on practice, inducement to a virtuous life. But there was one insuperable obstacle to a life of purity and holiness, the vicious examples of their Gods. EGO HOMUNCIO HOC NON FACEREM*? was the absolving Formula, whenever any one was resolved to give a loose to his appetites †. But the mischief went still farther; They not only thought themselves excused by the example, but even drawn, by a divine impulse of their Gods. When the young man in the Aulularia of Plautus apologises to Euclio for having debauched his Daughter, he says,

"Deus mihi IMPULSOR fuit, Is me ad illam ILLEXIT ‡."

And by a passage in his Amphitruo, where he makes Mercury joke upon the office of a Parasite in the

* Terence, Eun. act. iii. sc. vi.—Euripides puts this argument into the mouth of several of his speakers, up and down his tragedies. Helen, in the fourth act of the Trojan Dames, says, "How could I resist a Goddess, whom Jupiter himself obeys?" Ion, in his play of that name, in the latter end of the first act, speaks to the same purpose: and in the fifth act of Hercules Furens, Theseus comforts his friend by the examples of the crimes of the Gods. See likewise his Hippolytus, act ii. sc. ii. The learned and ingenious Mr. Seward, in his tract of the Conformity between Popery and Paganism, has taken notice of a difficult passage in this tragedy, which he has very ably explained, on the system here delivered of the detection of Polytheism in the sacred *Mysteries.*

† — ὁ δὲ πολὺς κ) ἀφιλοσόφητ@· ὄχλ@· ἐπὶ τὰ χείρω λαμβάνειν φιλεῖ τὰς περὶ αὐτῶν λόγους, κ) πάσχει θάτερον, ἢ καλαφρονεῖν τῶν θεῶν, ὡς ἐν πολλῇ κακοδαιμονίᾳ κυλινδεμένων· ἢ τῶν αἰσχίστων τε κ) παρανομωτάτων ἐδινὸς ἀπέχεται, θεοῖς ὁρῶν αὐτὰ πρασκείμενα. Dion. Halicar. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ii. cap. 8.

‡ Act. 4. Sc. 10.

description he gives of his own obsequiousness to his father Jupiter, we see it was grown up into an avowed Principle:

" Amanti [patri] supparasitor, hortor, asto, admoneo,
" gaudeo.
" Siquid patri volup' est, voluptas ea mihi multo
" maxima est.
" Amat, sapit: recte facit, animo quando obse-
" quitur suo *."

He then addresses himself to the audience, and tells them gravely, that men, in like manner, after the example of Jupiter, should indulge their passions, where they can do it decently.——

" Quod omnes homines facere OPORTET, dum id
" modo fiat bono."

And the licentious rites, in the OPEN worship of their Gods, gave still greater encouragement to these conclusions. Plato, in his book *Of Laws*, forbids drinking to excess; unless, says he, during the feasts of Bacchus, and in honour of that God †. And Aristotle, in his *Politics*, having blamed all lewd and obscene images and pictures, excepts those of the Gods, which Religion had sanctified. When St. Austin ‡ had quoted the *Ego homuncio hoc non facerem*, to shew his adversaries what mischief these stories did to the morals of the people; he makes the defenders of Paganism reply, that it was true; but then (say they) these things were only taught in the Fables of the poets, which, an attention to the MYSTERIES would rectify: " At enim

* Act. iii. Sc. iv. † Lib. vi.

‡ Civ. Dei, L. II. Cap. 7. in fine, et 8. in initio.

" non

" non traduntur ista SACRIS deorum, sed Fabulis " poetarum *."

For the *Mysteries* professed to exact nothing difficult, of the initiated †, which they would not assist him to perform. It was necessary, then, to remedy this evil; which they did, by striking at the root of it. So that, such of the *Initiated* as were judged capable, were made acquainted with the whole delusion. The MYSTAGOGUE taught them, that Jupiter, Mercury, Bacchus, Venus, Mars, and the whole rabble of licentious Deities, were only DEAD MORTALS; subject, in life, to the same passions and infirmities with themselves; but having been, on other accounts, Benefactors to mankind, grateful Posterity had deified them; and, with their virtues, had indiscreetly canonized their vices. The fabulous Gods being thus routed, the supreme cause of all things naturally took their place. HIM they were taught to consider as the Creator of the Universe, who pervaded all things by his virtue, and governed all by his power. But here it must be observed, that the discovery of this *supreme Cause* they made to be consistent with the notion of local tutelary Deities, Beings superior to men, and inferior to God, and by him set over the several parts of his creation. This was an opinion universally holden by learned Antiquity, and never brought into question by any Theist.

* This the *Father* could not deny; but observes, however, that in the THEN *corrupt state* of the *Mysteries* the remedy was become part of the disease: " Nolo dicere ILLA MYSTICA quam ista *thea-* " *trica* esse turpiora."

† Ἀλλ' ἔσομαι διὰ τὴν τελετὴν πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἑτοιμότατος. Sopat. in Div. Quæst. Καθάπερ ἄλλῳ μυητρίῳ προλελεγθεὶς τῇ σιωπῇ, τῶν ἄλλων ἁμαρτημάτων λοιπὸν τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ βίον ἐκάθαιρεν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν θείαν τῶν θεῶν τελεῖν ἐπειγόμενος, ἐκκλίνειν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐσπούδαζον. Sopat. ibidem.

What the ἀπόῤῥητα overthrew in their reformed theology, was the vulgar Polytheism, the worship of dead men. From this time, the initiated had the title of ΕΠΟΠΤΗΣ, by which was meant *one that sees things as they are, and without disguise*; whereas, before, he was called ΜΥΣΤΗΣ, which has a contrary signification.

But, besides the prevention of vice, their bringing the Initiated acquainted with the national Gods had another important use, which was to excite them to HEROIC VIRTUE, by shewing them what honours the benefactors of nations had acquired, by the free exercise of it. And this (as will be shewn hereafter) was the chief reason why Princes, Statesmen, and Leaders of colonies and armies, all aspired to be partakers of the GREATER MYSTERIES.

Thus we see, how what was taught and required in the *lesser Mysteries*, became the foundation of instruction in the GREATER: the obligation to a good life *there*, made it necessary to remove the errors of vulgar polytheism *here*; and the doctrine of a Providence taught previously in *those*, facilitated the reception of the sole cause of all things, when finally revealed in *these*.

Such were the TRUTHS which Varro, as quoted above, tells us it was inexpedient for the People to know: for indeed he supposed, the error of vulgar Polytheism to be so inveterate, that it was not to be expelled without throwing Society into convulsions. But Plato spoke out: he owned it to be "difficult "to find the Father and Creator of the universe: and, "when found, impossible to discover him to all the "world *."

* Τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον, καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν. In Timæo.

Besides,

Besides, there was another reason why the Institutors of the *Mysteries*, who were LAWGIVERS, should be for secreting this truth. They themselves had the chief hand in the rise of vulgar Polytheism *. They contrived it for the sake of the State; and to keep the people in awe, under a greater veneration for their laws. *This* Polytheism, the poets had depraved, by inventing or recording vicious stories of the Gods and Heroes, which the Lawgivers were willing should be stifled †. And they were only *such* stories, that, in their opinion, (as may be seen in Plato) made Polytheism hurtful to the State.

Scævola, that most learned Pontifex, as St. Austin calls him, gives this very account of the matter, where he says, There were three Systems concerning the GODS, the *Poetic*, the *Philosophic*, and the *Civil:* the first, he says, was *nugatory*, and therefore hurtful to the virtue of the State: the second *incongruous* to public establishments, by creating disorder and confusion in the speculative opinions of the People; such

* See the second Section of this Book.

† Plato has a remarkable passage to this purpose. Speaking, in the beginning of his twelfth book Of Laws, concerning theft, and fraud, and rapine, he takes notice of the popular stories told of Mercury, as if he delighted in such things, and patronized those who did; the philosopher says they are not true; and cautions men from being led away by such pretended examples. However, to make all sure, he takes up the method of the *mysteries*, and adds, that if, indeed, Mercury did, or encouraged such things, he was neither a God, nor of celestial original.—κλοπὴ μὲν χρημάτων, ἀνελεύθερον, ἁρπαγὴ δὲ, ἀναίσχυντον· τῶν Διὸς δὲ υἱεῶν ἐξεῖς ὅτε δόλοις, ὅτε βίᾳ χαίρων ἐπιλετήδευκε τούτοιν ἑτέρων· μηδεὶς ἓν ὑπὸ ποιητῶν, μηδ' ἄλλως ὑπό τινῶν μυθολόγων, πλημμελῶν περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐξαπατώμενος ἀναπειθέσθω. κἀ κλέπτων ἢ βιαζόμενος, οἰέσθω μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν ποιεῖν, ἀλλ' ἅπερ αὐτοὶ θεοὶ δρῶσιν· ὅτε γὰρ ἀληθὲς, ἔτ' εἰκὸς· ἀλλ' ὅσις δρᾷ τοιοῦτον παρανόμως, ὅτε θεὸς ὅτες παῖς ἐσί πολε θεῶν.

as

as the teaching them, promiscuously, that the Popular Gods were dead men deified. The directors of the *third* System therefore prevented the mischiefs of the *first* by such a partial communication of the *second* System, as was necessary for that purpose *.

That this account of the SECRET, in the *greater Mysteries*, is no precarious hypothesis, standing on mere conjecture, I shall now endeavour to shew,

First, from the clear evidence of Antiquity, which expressly informs us of these two particulars; That the ERRORS OF POLYTHEISM were detected, and the DOCTRINE OF THE UNITY was taught and explained in the *Mysteries*. But here it is to be observed, that when the Ancients speak of *Mysteries* indefinitely, they generally mean the *greater*.

It hath been shewn, that the Grecian and Asiatic *Mysteries* came originally from Egypt. Now of the EGYPTIAN, St. Austin giveth us this remarkable account.—" Of the same nature, too, are those things " which Alexander of Macedon wrote to his mother, " as revealed unto him by one LEO †, chief Hierophant

* Relatum est in literis, doctissimum Pontificem Scævolam disputasse tria genera tradita Deorum; unum a poetis, alterum a philosophis, tertium a principibus civitatis. Primum genus nugatorium dicit esse—Secundum non congruere civitatibus, quod habeant aliqua—quæ obsint populis nosse—Quæ sunt autem illa quæ prolata in multitudinem nocent? " Hæc, inquit; non esse " deos Herculem, Æsculapium, Castorem, Pollucem: proditur " enim a doctis, quod homines fuerint, & humana conditione de- " fecerint."—Augustin. De Civit. Dei, lib. iv. cap. 27. in initio.

† It is not unlikely but this might be a name of office. Porphyry, in his fourth book Of Abstinence, § 16. Edit. Cantabr. 1655, 8vo, informs us, that the priests of the *Mysteries* of Mithras

" phant of the Egyptian *Mysteries:* whereby it ap-
" peared, that not only such as Picus, and Faunus,
" and Æneas, and Romulus, nay Hercules, and Æs-
" culapius, and Bacchus the son of Semele, and Cas-
" tor, and Pollux, and all others of the same rank,
" had been advanced, from the condition of mortal
" Men, into Gods; but that even those Deities of the
" higher order, the *Dii majorum gentium*, those whom
" Cicero, without naming, seems to hint at, in his
" *Tusculans*, such as Jupiter, Juno, Saturn, Neptune,
" Vulcan, Vesta, and many others (whom Varro
" endeavours to allegorize into the elements or parts
" of the world) were, in truth, only deceased mortals.
" But the Priest being under great fears and appre-
" hensions, while he was telling this, as conscious that
" he was betraying the SECRET OF THE MYSTERIES,
" begged of Alexander, when he found that he intend-
" ed to communicate it to his mother *, that he would
" enjoin

thras were called *Lions*; the priestesses *Lionesses*; and the inferior ministers, *Ravens*. Τὰς μὲν αὐτῶν ὀργίων μύστας, Λέαινας καλεῖν· τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας· Λεαίνας. τοὺς δὲ ὑπηρετεῖλας, Κόρακας: for there was a great conformity, in the practices and ceremonies of the several *Mysteries*, throughout the whole pagan world. And this conjecture is supported by a passage in Eunapius, which seems to say, that it was unlawful to reveal the *name* of the Hierophant. ———τῇ δὲ Ἱεροφάνῃ, κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ὅσις ἦν τὄνομα ἔ μοι θέμις λέγειν— *in Maximo*, p. 74. Edit. Comelini, 8vo, 1616.—It looks as if the corruptions and debaucheries of some of the *Mysteries*, in later times, had made this further provision for *secrecy*.

* I suppose this communication to his Mother, might be with a purpose to let her understand, that he was no longer the dupe of her fine story of Jupiter's invasion, and the intrigue of his divine original. For Eratosthenes, according to Plutarch, Edit. Francof. fol. 1599. T. I. p. 665, E. says, that Olympias, when she brought Alexander on his way to the army, in his first military expedition, acquainted

" enjoin her to burn the letter, as soon as she had read " it*."

To understand the concluding part, we are to know, that Cyprian (who has also preserved this curious anecdote) tells us, it was the dread of Alexander's power which extorted the secret from the hierophant †.

But

acquainted him, in private, with this secret of his birth: and exhorted him to behave himself as became the son of Jupiter Hammon. This, I suppose, Alexander might boast of to the Priest, and so the murder came out.

* In eo genere sunt etiam illa—quæ Alexander Macedo scribit ad matrem, sibi a magno antistite sacrorum Ægyptiorum quodam LEONE patefacta: ubi non Picus & Faunus, & Æneas & Romulus, vel etiam Hercules & Æsculapius, & Liber Semele natus, & Tyndaridæ fratres, & si quos alios ex mortalibus pro diis habent; sed ipsi etiam majorum gentium dii, quos Cicero in Tusculanis, tacitis nominibus, videtur attingere, Jupiter, Juno, Saturnus, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Vesta, & alii plurimi, quos Varro conatur ad mundi partes sive elementa transferre, homines fuisse produntur. Timens enim & ille quasi revelata mysteria, petens admonet Alexandrum, ut cum ea matri conscripta insinuaverit, flammis jubeat concremari. De Civit. Dei, lib. viii. cap. 5.

† — metu suæ potestatis proditum sibi de diis hominibus a sacerdote SECRETUM. De Idol. Ven. *circa initium.* But this is a mistake, at least it is expressed inaccurately. What was extorted by the dread of Alexander's power, was not the *secret* (which the initiated had a right to) but the Priest's consent that he should *communicate* the secret to another, which was contrary to the laws of the *Mysteries.* Plutarch, in his life of Alexander, Edit. Francof. fol. 1599, p. 680. E. appears to refer to this very Epistle of Alexander to his Mother, where he says,—Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν ἐπιστολῇ πρὸς τὴν μητέρα, φησὶν γεγονέναι τινὰς ἀύλῳ μανίας ἀποῤῥήτους, ἃς ἐπανελθὼν φράσει πρὸς μόνην ἐκείνην. " Alexander in the Epistle says that there were certain Oracular Mysteries imparted to him, which on his return he would communicate to her under the same seal of secrecy." For at this time the *Mysteries* foretold the future, as well as revealed the past.

But Tully brings the matter home to the ELEUSINIAN *Mysteries* themselves. "What (says he) is not "almost all Heaven, not to carry on this detail any "further, filled with the Human race? But if I should "search and examine Antiquity, and from those "things which the Grecian writers have delivered, go "to the bottom of this affair, it would be found, that "even those very Gods themselves who are deemed "the *Dii majorum gentium*, had their original here "below; and ascended from hence into Heaven. "Enquire, to whom those Sepulchres belong, which "are so commonly shewn in Greece *. REMEMBER, "for you are initiated, WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN "TAUGHT IN THE MYSTERIES; YOU WILL THEN "AT LENGTH UNDERSTAND HOW FAR THIS MAT-"TER MAY BE CARRIED †." Indeed, he carries it further himself; for he tells us, in another place, that not only the *Eleusinian Mysteries*, but the *Samothracian* likewise, and the *Lemnian*, taught the error of Polytheism, agreeably to this system; which supposes all the *Mysteries* derived from the same original, and instituted for the same ends. "What think you (says "he) of those who assert, that valiant, or famous, or "powerful men have obtained divine honours after "death; and that these are the very Gods, now be-

* Alluding to that of Jupiter in Crete.

† Quid? totum prope cœlum, ne plures persequar, nonne humana genere completum est? Si vero scrutari vetera, & ex his ea, quæ scriptores *Græciæ* prodiderunt, eruere coner; ipsi illi, majorum gentium Dii qui habentur, hinc a nobis profecti in cœlum reperiuntur. Quære, quorum demonstrantur sepulchra in *Græcia*: REMINISCERE, QUONIAM ES INITIATUS QUÆ TRADANTUR MYSTERIIS; TUM DENIQUE QUAM HOC LATE PATEAT, INTELLIGES. Tusc. Disp. lib. i. cap. 12, 13. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. II. p. 243.—See note D, at the end of this Book.

"come

" come the object of our worship, our prayers, and " adoration? EUHEMERUS tells us, when these Gods " died, and where they lie buried. *I forbear to speak* " *of the sacred and august rites of* ELEUSIS.—*I pass by* " Samothrace, *and the* Mysteries *of* Lemnos, *whose* " *hidden rites are celebrated in darkness, and amidst* " *the thick shades of groves and forests* *."

Julius Fermicus speaks much to the same purpose, and even more directly, " Adhuc supersunt aliæ su- " perstitiones, quarum secreta pandenda sunt Liberi & " Liberæ, quæ omnia sacris sensibus vestris specialiter " intimanda sunt, ut in istis profanis religionibus sciatis " MORTES ESSE HOMINUM CONSECRATAS. *Liber* " itaque, Jovis fuit filius, regis scil. Cretici," &c. †

What hath been here said, will let us into the meaning of Plutarch's hint, in the following words of his tract *Concerning the ceasing of oracles.* " As to the " *Mysteries*, in whose representations the true NA- " TURE OF DEMONS is clearly and accurately held " forth, a sacred silence, to use an expression of He- " rodotus, is to be observed ‡." All this well illus-

* Quid, qui aut fortes, aut claros aut potentes viros tradunt, *post mortem ad Deos venisse*, eosque esse ipsos, quos nos colere, precari, venerarique soleamus—Ab Euhemero *& mortes & sepulturæ demonstrantur deorum*—Omitto *Eleusinam* sanctam illam & augustam—Prætereo *Samothraciam*, eaque, quæ

Lemni nocturno aditu occulta coluntur
Silvestribus sæpibus densa.

De Nat. Deor. lib. i. cap. 42. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. II. p. 432, 33.—— See note E, at the end of this Book.

† De errore profan. relig. cap. vi. Edit. Oxon. 1662, 16mo, pag. 9.

‡ Περὶ τῶν μυστικῶν ἐν οἷς τὰς μεγίστας ἐμφάσεις καὶ διαφάσεις λαβεῖν ἔστι τῆς περὶ δαιμόνων ἀληθείας, εὔστομά μοι κείσθω, καθ' Ἡρόδοτον. P. 742. lin. 3. Steph. edit.

trates

trates a passage in Lucian's *Council of the Gods*; when, after Momus had ridiculed the monstrous Deities of Egypt, Jupiter replies, " It is true, these are " abominable things, which you mention of the Egyp- " tian Worship. But then, consider, Momus, that " much of it is *enigmatical*; and so, consequently, " a very unfit subject for the buffoonry of the Pro- " phane and Uninitiated." To which, the other answers with much spirit, " Yes, indeed, we have " great occasion for the MYSTERIES, to know that " Gods are Gods, and monsters, monsters*."

Thus far in detection of the vulgar Polytheism.— With regard to the other part of the SECRET, the *doctrine of the* UNITY, Clemens Alexandrinus informs us, that the Egyptian Mystagogues taught it amongst their *greater secrets*. " The Egyptians (says he) did " not use to reveal their *Mysteries* indiscriminately to " all, nor expose their truths concerning their Gods to " the Prophane, but to those only who were to succeed " to the administration of the State: and to such of the " Priests as were most approved, by their education, " learning, and quality †."

But, to come to the Grecian *Mysteries*. Chrysippus, as quoted by the author of the *Etymol. magnum*, speaks to this purpose. " And Chrysippus says, that

* Αἰσχρὰ ὡς ἀληθῶς ταῦτα φὴς τὰ περὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων· ὅμως δ' οὖν, ὦ Μῶμε, τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν αἰνίγματά ἐστι καὶ οὐ πάνυ χρὴ καταγελᾶν ἀμύητον ὄντα· ΜΩΜ. Πάνυ γοῦν ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΝ, ὦ Ζεῦ, δεῖ ἡμῖν, ὡς εἰδέναι θεοὺς μὲν τοὺς θεούς· κυνοκεφάλους δὲ τοὺς κυνοκεφάλους. Edit. Reitzii, T. III. p. 534.

† Αἰγύπτιοι οὐ τοῖς ἐπιτυχοῦσι τὰ παρὰ σφίσιν ἀνετίθεντο μυστήρια οὐδὲ μὴν βαβήλοις τὴν τῶν θείων εἴδησιν ἐξέφερον, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνοις γε τοῖς μέλλουσιν ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν προϊέναι· καὶ τῶν ἱερέων τοῖς κριθεῖσιν εἶναι δοκιμωτάτοις ἀπὸ τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τῆς παιδείας καὶ τοῦ γένους. Strom. lib. v. p. 566. edit. Lut. [p. 413. l. 16. edit. Sylburg.]

" the

" the secret doctrines concerning divine matters, are " rightly called ΤΕΛΕΤΑι, for that these are the last " things the initiated should be informed of: The soul " having gained an able support; and, being possessed " of her desires *, can keep silent before the Uninitiated " and Prophane †." To the same purpose, Clemens: " The doctrines delivered in the *greater Mysteries*, " are concerning the UNIVERSE. Here all instruction " ends. Things are seen as they are; and Nature, " and the things of Nature, are given to be compre- " hended ‡."

Strabo having said §, that *Nature dictated to men the institution of the Mysteries*, as well as the other rites of Religion, gives this remarkable reason for his assertion, " that the secret celebration of the *Mys-* " *teries* preserves the majesty due to the Divinity, and, " at the same time, imitates its nature, which hides " itself from our senses ‖." A plain intimation of what kind the *secret* was. But had there been any ambiguity, he presently removes it, where, speaking of the

* i.e. mistress of herself.

† Χρύσιππος δὲ φησὶ, τὰς περὶ τῶν θείων λόγους εἰκότως καλεῖσθαι τελετάς· χρῆναι γὰρ τότε τελεταίους, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι διδάσκεσθαι. τῆς ψυχῆς ἐχούσης ἔρμα, καὶ κεκραλημένης, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀμυήτους σιωπᾶν δυναμένης· μέγα γὰρ εἶναι τὸ ἄθλον, ὑπὲρ θεῶν ἀκούσαί τε ἐρθά, καὶ ἐγκραλεῖς γενέσθαι αὐτῶν. Etymol. Auctor, in ΤΕΛΕΤΗ.

‡ Τὰ δὲ μεγάλα περὶ τῶν συμπάντων· ὰ μανθάνει ἔτι ὑπολείπεται, ἐποπτεύειν δὲ καὶ περινοεῖν τήν τε φύσιν καὶ τὰ πράγματα. Strom. v. p. 424. C. Edit. Sylburgh.

§ ἡ φύσις ἔτως ὑπαγορεύει. lib. x. p. 467. Edit. Paris. 1620, fol.

‖ ἤτε κρύψις ἡ μυστικὴ, τῶν ἱερῶν σεμνοποιεῖ τὸ θεῖον. μιμεμένη τὴν φύσιν αὐτῆ ἐκφεύγουσαν ἡμῶν τὴν αἴσθησιν. Ibid. Here Strabo takes in all that is said, both of the *Gods*, and of *nature*, in the two preceding passages from Chrysippus and Clemens; and shews that by *nature* is not meant the *cosmical* but *theological* nature.

different

different faculties exercised in the different rites of Religion, he makes *Philosophy* to be the object of the *Mysteries* *. Plutarch expressly says, that the FIRST CAUSE of all things is communicated to those who approach the temple of Isis with prudence and sanctity †. By which words he means, the *necessary qualifications for Initiation.*

We have seen Tully expressly declaring, that the *Eleusinian* and *Samothracian Mysteries* were partly employed in detecting the error of Polytheism. We shall now find Galen intimating, not obscurely, that the doctrine of the divine nature was taught in those very *Mysteries.* In his excellent tract *Of the use of the parts* of the human body, he has these words—" The " study, therefore, of *the use of the parts*, is not only " of service to the mere physician, but of much greater " to him who joins Philosophy to the art of healing; " and, in order to perfect himself in this *Mystery*, la- " bours to investigate the *universal Nature.* They " who *initiate* themselves here, whether private men " or bodies, will find, in my opinion, nobler instruc- " tion than in the rites either of ELEUSIS or SAMO- " THRACE ‡." By which he means, that the study of the *use of the parts of animals*, leads us easier and

* — καὶ τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν.

† — ὀνομάζεσθαι γὰρ Ἴσειον ὡς εἰσόμενον τὸ ὄν, ἂν μετὰ λόγου καὶ ὁσίως εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ παρέλθωμεν τῆς θεοῦ. ΙΣ. καὶ ΟΣ. Edit. Franc. fol. 1599. T. II. p. 352. A. in initio libri.

‡ ὃν ἂν ἰδίᾳ μόνον ἡ περὶ χρείας μορίων ἐγὶ πραγματεία χρησίμη, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον ἰατρῷ φιλοσόφῳ, τῆς ὅλης φύσεως ἐπιστήμην κλήσασθαι σπεύδοντι, καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν χρὴ τελεῖσθαι τὴν τελευτήν, ἅπαντας γὰρ, ὡς οἶμαι, καὶ κατ' ἔθνη, καὶ κατ' ἀριθμὸν ἀνθρώπους, ὅσοι τι μυοῦσιν ἑαυτοὺς, εὑρήσειν ὅμοιον ἔχουσιν Ἐλευσινίοις τε καὶ Σαμοθρακίοις ὀργίοις. Gal. De usu part. lib. xvii. c. 1. p. 702. E. F. Edit. Charterii, Fol. Paris. 1679. Petit, instead of ὅσοι τιμῶσιν ἑαυτοὺς, reads very ingeniously ὅσοι τι μυοῦσιν ἑαυτούς. Charterius, ὅσοι τιμῶσε θεοὺς.

sooner up to the knowledge of the FIRST CAUSE, than the most venerable of the *Mysteries*, such as the *Eleusinian* and *Samothracian*. A clear implication, that to lead men thither was their special business.

But this seems to have been so well known to the learned in the time of EUSEBIUS, that where this writer takes occasion to observe, that the Hebrews were the only people whose object, in their *public and national worship*, was the GOD OF THE UNIVERSE, he suits his whole expression, by one continued metaphor, to the usages of the *Mysteries*. "For the Hebrew people "alone (says he) was reserved the honour of being "INITIATED into the knowledge of God the Creator "of all things, and of being instructed in the practice of "true piety towards him*." Where, ΕΠΟΠΤΕΙΑ, which signifies *the inspection of the secret* ΘΕΩΡΙΑ, the *contemplation* of it; and ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΣ, the *Creator*, the subject of it, are all words appropriated to the *secret* of the *greater Mysteries*.

JOSEPHUS is still more express. He tells Appion, that that high and sublime knowledge, which the Gentiles with difficulty attained unto, in the rare and temporary celebration of their *Mysteries*, was habitually taught to the Jews, at all times. And what was this sublime knowledge, but the doctrine of the UNITY? "Can any Government (says he) be more holy than "this? or any Religion better adapted to the nature "of the Deity? Where, in any place but in this, are "the whole People, by the special diligence of the "Priests, to whom the care of public instruction is

* μόνῳ δὲ τῷ Ἑβραίων γένει τὴν ΕΠΟΠΤΕΙΑΝ ἀναλεθεῖσθαι τῆς ΘΕΩΡΙΑΣ τῇ τῶν ὅλων ποιητῇ καὶ ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΣ Θεῷ, καὶ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀληθὲς εὐσεβείας. Præp. Evang. lib. i. cap. 9. See note [F] at the end of this Book.

"committed,

" committed, accurately taught the principles of true " piety? So that the body-politic seems, as it were, one " great *Assembly*, constantly kept together, for the " celebration of some sacred *Mysteries*. For those " things which the Gentiles keep up for a few days " only, that is, during those solemnities they call " MYSTERIES and INITIATIONS, we, with vast delight, " and a plenitude of knowledge, which admits of no " error, fully enjoy, and perpetually contemplate " through the whole course of our lives. If you ask " (continues he) the nature of those things, which in " our sacred rites are enjoined and forbidden; I " answer, they are simple, and easily understood. The " first instruction relates to the DEITY, and teaches, " that GOD CONTAINS ALL THINGS, and is a Being " every way perfect and happy: that he is self-existent, " and the SOLE CAUSE of all existence; the begin- " ning, the middle, and the end of all things*," &c.

Nothing can be more explicit than the testimony of this learned Jew. He not only alludes to the *greater Mysteries*, by the direct terms of τελετῆς and μυςήρια, but uses several expressions relative to what the gentile *Mystagogues* taught therein; such as ἀλλόφυλοι φυλάττειν ȣ̓ δύνανται, referring to the unfitness of the

* Τίς ἂν ȣ̃ν ἀρχὴ γένοιτο ταῦτης ὁσιωτέρα; τίς δὲ Θεῷ τιμὴ μᾶλλον ἁρμόζȣσα, παντὸς μὲν τȣ̃ πλήθȣς κατεσκευασμένȣ πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν, ἐξαίρετον δὲ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν ἱερέων πεπιςευμένων, ὥσπερ δὲ τελετῆς τινος τῆς ὅλης πολιτείας οἰκονομȣμένης; ἃ γὰρ ὀλίγων ἡμερῶν ἀριθμὸν ἐπιτηδεύοντες ἀλλόφυλοι φυλάττειν ȣ̓ δύνανται, μυςήρια κ̀ τελετὰς ὀνομάζοντες, ταῦτα μετὰ πολλῆς ἡδονῆς κ̀ γνώμης ἀμεταπείςȣ φυλάττομεν ἡμεῖς διὰ τȣ̃ παντὸς αἰῶνος· τίνες ȣ̃ν εἰσιν αἱ προῤῥήσεις κ̀ ἀπαγορεύσεις; ἁπλαῖ τε κ̀ γνώριμοι· πρώτη δ' ἡγεῖται περὶ Θεȣ̃, λέγȣσα, ὁ Θεὸς ἔχει τὰ πάντα παντελὴς κ̀ μακάριος, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ κ̀ πᾶσιν αὐτάρκης, ἀρχὴ κ̀ μέσα, κ̀ τέλος πάντων. Cont. Ap. lib. ii. cap. 22. pag. 1379, lin. 30.

 doctrine

doctrine of the unity for general instruction: such as μετὰ πολλῆς ἡδονῆς, in contradiction to what they taught of the labours, pain, and difficulties to be encountered by those who aspired to the knowledge of the first cause; such as ἁπλαῖ καὶ γνώριμοι, in contradiction to what they taught of the great intricacy and obscurity of the question; and such, again, as ὁ Θεὸς ἔχει τὰ πάντα, the characteristic of the ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΣ of the *Mysteries.*

Thus, I think, it appears, that the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, in the *greater mysteries,* were the detection of the origine of vulgar *Polytheism**; and the discovery of the doctrine of the *Unity*†.

But now I have gone thus far, I will venture one step further; and undertake to give the very HISTORY repeated, and the very HYMN sung, on these occasions, to the *initiated.* In the *first* of which was delivered the true origine and progress of VULGAR POLYTHEISM; and in the *other*, the doctrine of the UNITY.

For I am much mistaken, if that celebrated fragment of SANCHONIATHO, the Phœnician, translated by Philo-Byblius, and preserved by Eusebius, containing a genealogical account of the first ages, be not that very HISTORY; as it was wont to be read to the *initiated,* in the celebration of the *Egyptian* and *Phœnician Mysteries.* The purpose of it being to inform us, that their popular Gods (whose chronicle is there given according to their generations) were only dead men deified.

* See note [G] at the end of this Book.

† See this account supported, and the objections to it clearly confuted, in a well reasoned tract lately printed, intitled, A Dissertation on the ancient Pagan Mysteries.

And

And as this curious and authentic *record* (for such we shall find it was) not only serves to illustrate the subject we are now upon, but will be of use to support what is said hereafter of the rise, progress, and order of the several species of ancient idolatry, it may not be improper to give a short extract of it in this place.

I. He tells us then, that, "of the two first mortals, Protogonus and Ænon, (the latter of whom was the author of seeking and procuring food from forest-trees) were begotten Genos and Genea. These, in the time of great droughts, stretched their hands upwards to the SUN, whom they regarded as a God, and sole ruler of the heavens. From these, after two or three generations, came Upsouranios and his brother Ousous. One of them invented the art of building cottages of reeds and rushes; the other the art of making garments of the skins of wild beasts. In their time, violent tempests of wind and rain having rubbed the large branches of the forest-trees against one another, they took fire, and burnt up the woods. Of the bare trunks of trees, they first made vessels to pass the waters; they consecrated two pillars to FIRE and WIND, and then offered bloody sacrifices to them as to Gods*." And

* Αἰῶνα καὶ Πρωτόγονον θνητοὺς ἄνδρας, ἕτω καλουμένους· εὑρεῖν δὲ τὸν Αἰῶνα τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων τροφήν. ἐκ τούτων τοὺς γενομένους κληθῆναι Γένος, καὶ Γενεάν—αὐχμῶν δὲ γενομένων, τὰς χεῖρας ὀρέγειν εἰς οὐρανὸν πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον, τοῦτον γάρ, φησὶ, θεὸν ἐνόμιζον μόνον οὐρανοῦ κύριον—εἶτά φησι τὸν Ὑψουράνιον οἰκῆσαι Τύρον, καλύβας τε ἐπινοῆσαι ἀπὸ καλάμων, καὶ θρύων, καὶ παπύρων· τοὺσιάσαι δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Οὐσωὸν· ὃς σκέπην τῷ σώματι πρῶτος ἐκ δερμάτων ὧν ἴσχυσε συλλαβεῖν θηρίων εὗρε, ῥαγδαίων δὲ γινομένων ὄμβρων καὶ πνευμάτων παραλιβέντα τὰ ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ δένδρα πῦρ ἀνάψαι, καὶ τὴν αὐτόθι ὕλην καταφλέξαι. δένδρου δὲ λαβόμενον τὸν Οὐσωὸν καὶ ἀποκλαδεύσαντα πρῶτον τολμῆσαι εἰς θάλασσαν ἐμβῆναι· ἀνιερῶσαι δὲ δύο ξύλα πυρί τε καὶ πνεύματι καὶ προσκυνῆσαι, ἅμα τε σπένδειν αὐταῖς, ἐξ ὧν ἤγρευε θηρίων.

here let it be observed, that this *worship of the Elements* and heavenly Bodies is truly represented as the FIRST species of idolatry.

II. "After many generations, came Chrysor; and he likewise invented many things useful to civil life; for which, after his decease, he was worshipped as a God *. Then flourished Ouranos and his sister Ge; who deified and offered sacrifices to their father, Upsistos, when he had been torn in pieces by wild beasts †. Afterwards Cronos consecrated Muth his son, and was himself consecrated by his subjects ‡." And this is as truly represented to be the SECOND species of idolatry; the *worship of dead men.*

III. He goes on, and says, that "Ouranos was the inventor of the Bætylia, a kind of animated stones, framed with great art §. And that Taautus formed allegoric figures, characters, and images of the celestial Gods and elements ‖." In which is delivered the THIRD species of idolatry, *statue and brute worship.* For by the animated stones, is meant stones cut into a

* —— ἐξ ὧν γενέσθαι δύο ἀδελφὰς σιδήρᾳ εὑρεῖας, καὶ τῆς τέτε ἐξασίας· ὧν θάτερον τὸν Ἥφαιςον. εὑρεῖν δὲ καὶ ἄγκιςρον, καὶ δέλεαρ, καὶ ὁρμιὰν, καὶ σχεδιάν· πρῶτόν τε πάντων ἀνθρώπων πλεῦσαι. διὸ καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν μετὰ θάνατον ἐσεβάσθησαν.

† Ὁ δὲ τέτων παῖς ὁ Ὕψιςος ἐκ συμβολῆς θηρίων τελευτήσας ἀφιερώθη, ᾧ καὶ χοὰς καὶ θυσίας οἱ παῖδες ἐτέλεσαν.

‡ — Καὶ μετ' ὀ πολὺ, ἕτερον αὐτῷ παῖδα ἀπὸ Ῥέας ὀνομαζόμενον Μῦθ ἀποθανόντα ἀφιεροῖ—Κρόνῳ τοίνυν, βασιλεύων τῆς χώρας, καὶ ὕςερον μετὰ τὴν τῦ βίᾳ τελευτὴν εἰς τὸν τῦ Κρόνᾳ ἀςέρα καθιερωθείς.

§ ἔτι δὲ, φησὶν, ἐπενόησε Θεὸς Οὐρανὸς Βαιτύλια, λίθᾳ ἐμψύχᾳ μηχανησάμενος—

‖ — περὶ δὲ τέτων Θεὸς Ταυτὸς μιμησάμενος τὸν Οὐρανὸν τῶν Θεῶν εἰκόνας, Κρόνᾳ τε καὶ Δαγῶνι, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν διετύπωσεν τὰς ἱερὰς τῶν στοιχείων χαρακτῆρας, &c.

human

human shape *; brute, unformed stones being before this invention consecrated and adored. As by Taautus's invention of allegoric figures, is insinuated (what was truly the fact) the origine of brute worship † from the use of HIEROGLYPHICS.

This is a very short and imperfect extract of the *Fragment*; many particulars, to avoid tediousness, are omitted, which would much support what we are upon, particularly a minute detail of the principal arts invented for the use of civil life. But what has been selected on this head will afford a good comment to a celebrated passage of Cicero, quoted, in this section, on another occasion.—As the two important doctrines, taught *in secret*, were the detection of *Polytheism*, and the discovery of the *Unity*; so, the two capital doctrines taught more *openly*, were the origine of Society with the arts of life, and the existence of the soul after death, in a state of reward or punishments. These latter doctrines Tully hints at in the following words: " — mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur " Athenæ peperisse—tum nihil melius illis *Mysteriis*, " quibus ex AGRESTI immanique vita EXCULTI ad " humanitatem & mitigati sumus:—neque solum cum " lætitia vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum " spe meliore moriendi ‡." The Fragment explains what Tully meant by *men's being drawn by the Mysteries from an irrational and savage life, and tamed,*

* So when the Egyptians first saw the Grecian artists separate the legs of their statues, they put fetters on them, to prevent their running away.

† See Div. Leg. book iv. § 4.

‡ De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 14. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 148.

as it were, and broken to humanity. It was, we see, by the information given them, concerning the origine of SOCIETY, and the Inventors of the ARTS OF LIFE; and the rewards they received from grateful Posterity, for having made themselves Benefactors to mankind. Tully, who thought this a strong excitement to public virtue, provides for it in his *Laws:*—" Divos, & eos, " qui cælestes semper habiti, colunto: & ollos, quos " endo cælo MERITA vocaverint Herculem, Liberum, " Æsculapium *," &c.

The reasons which induce me to think this Fragment the very *History* narrated to the Ἐποπτα, in the celebration of the *greater Mysteries,* are these:

1. It bears an exact conformity with what the Ancients tell us that *History* contained in general, namely, an instruction, that all the national Gods, as well those *majorum* (such as Hypsistus, Ouranos, and Cronos) as those *minorum gentium,* were only dead men deified: together with a recommendation of the advantages of civil life above the state of nature, and an excitement to the most considerable of the initiated (the *summatibus viris,* as Macrobius calls them) to procure it. And these two ends are served together, in the history of the rise and progress of idolatry as delivered in this Fragment. In the date it gives to the origine of idolatry, they were instructed that the two first mortals were not idolaters, and consequently, that idolatry was the corruption of a better Religion; a matter of importance, where the purpose was to discredit Polytheism. The History shews us too, that this had the common fate of all corruptions, of falling

* De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 8.

from

from bad to worse, from *elementary* worship to *human*, and from *human* to *brutal*. But this was not enough; it was necessary too to expose the unreasonableness of all these modes of superstition. And as this could be only done by shewing what gave birth to the several species's, we are told that not any occult or metaphysic influences of the heavenly or elementary Bodies upon men, but their common physical effects felt by us, occasioned the first worship to be paid unto them: that no imaginary Divinity in the minds of patriarchs and heroes occasioned Posterity to bring them into the number of the Gods; but a warm sense of gratitude for what they had invented for the introduction and promotion of civil life: and that even *brute-worship* was brought in without the least consideration to the animal, but as its figure was a symbol only of the properties of the two other species's. Again, in order to recommend civil life, and to excite men to promote it's advantages, a lively picture is given of his miserable condition; and how obnoxious he was, in that state, to the rage of all the elements, and how imperfectly, while he continued in it, he could, with all his industry, fence against them, by food of acorns, by cottages of reeds, and by garments of skins: a matter the *Mysteries* thought so necessary to be impressed, that we find, by Diodorus Siculus, there was a scenical representation of this state exhibited in their shows. And what stronger excitement had heroic minds, than to be taught, (as they are in this Fragment) that public benefits to their fellow creatures were rewarded with immortality. As all these things, therefore, so essential to the instruction of the *Mysteries*, are here taught with an art and disposition peculiarly calculated to promote those ends, we have reason to conclude,

that this History was composed for the use of the *Mysteries*.

2. My second reason for supposing it to be that very History, is our being told, that Sanchoniatho transcribed the account from secret records, kept in the penetralia of the temples, and written in a sacred sacerdotal character, called the Ammonean *, from the place where they were first deposited; (which, as Marsham reasonably supposes, was Ammonio, or Thebes, in Egypt †) a kind of writing employed, as we have shewn elsewhere, by the Hierophants of the *Mysteries*.

3. Thirdly, we are informed, that this sacred commentary was composed by the CABIRI, at the command, and by the direction, of Thoth ‡. Now These were the principal Hierophants of the *Mysteries*. The name CABIRI is, indeed, used by the Ancients, to signify indifferently three several persons; the GODS, in whose honour the *Mysteries* were instituted; the INSTITUTORS of the *Mysteries*; and the principal HIEROPHANTS who officiated in them. In the first sense we find it used by Herodotus, who speaks of the images of the *Cabiri* in the Egyptian temples §; and

* —ὁ δὲ συμβαλὼν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων εὑρεθεῖσαν ἀποκρύφοις Ἀμμωνιέων γράμμασι συγκειμένοις, ἃ δὴ ἐκ ἦν πᾶσι γνώριμα, τὴν μάθησιν ἀπάντων αὐτὸς ἤσκησε.

† Chron. Can. p. 234. Lond. edit.

‡ Ταῦτα δὲ, φησὶ, πρῶτοι πάνυ ὑπεμνηματίσαντο οἱ ἱεροὶ Συδὲκ παῖδες ΚΑΒΕΙΡΟΙ, καὶ ὄγδοῳ αὐτῶν ἀδελφὸς Ἀσκληπιὸς, ὃς αὐτοῖς ἐτελείωσε θεὸς Ταυτίς.

§ Καμβύσης—ἐσῆλθε δὲ καὶ ἐς τῶν Καβείρων τὸ ἱρὸν, ἐς τὸ ἐ θεμιτόν ἐστι ἰδεῖναι ἄλλον γε ἢ τὸν ἱρέα. ταῦτα δέ τ' ἀγάλματα καὶ ἐνέπρησε, πολλὰ καταγελάσας. lib. iii. cap. 37. p. 176. Edit. Gale.

by

by the scholiast on Apollonius, who tells us, there were four Samothracian *Cabiri*, Axieros, Axiokersa, Axiokersos, and Casmilus; that is to say, Ceres, Proserpine, Pluto, and Mercury. Pausanias, in his *Beotics*, uses the word in the second sense, where he makes mention of the *Cabiri* Prometheus and his son Ætnæus, to whom was committed the sacred deposit of the *Mysteries* by Ceres *. And Strabo uses it in the third sense, where he speaks of the *Cabiri* as Ministers in the sacred *Mysteries* †. It is no wonder there should be this difference amongst the ancients in their accounts of these Wights. *Cabiri* was a sacred appellation, which was transferred from the *God* of the Mysteries, through the *Institutors* of them, down to the *Ministers* who officiated in them. And in this last sense it is used by Sanchoniatho. The same kind of confusion, and proceeding from the same cause, we find in the ancient accounts concerning the founder of the *Eleusinian Mysteries*, as we shall see hereafter; Some ascribing the institution to Ceres or Triptolemus, the Gods in whose honour they were celebrated; others, to Erectheus, who indeed founded them: others again, to Eumolpus and Musæus, the first who ministred there in the office of Hierophants.

* Πόλιν γάρ πού ἐν τούτῳ φασὶν εἶναι τῷ χωρίῳ, καὶ ἄνδρας ὀνομαζομένους Καβείρους. Προμηθεῖ δὲ ἐνὶ τῶν Καβειραίων καὶ Αἰταίῳ τῷ Προμηθέως ἀφικομένην Δήμητραν εἰς γνῶσιν παρακαλαθέσθαι σφίσιν. ἥτις μὲν δὴ ἦν ἡ παρακαλαθήκη, καὶ τὰ εἰς αὐτὴν γενόμενα, ἐκ ἐφαίνετο ὅσιόν μοι γράφειν. Δημήτρος γὰν Καβειραίοις δῶρόν ἐστιν ἡ τελετή. Bœot. lib. ix. cap. 25. pag. 758, 59. Edit. Kuknii, fol. Lips. 1696.

† — τῶν μὲν, τὰς αὐτὰς τοῖς Κορήσι τὰς Κορύβαντας καὶ ΚΑΒΕΙΡΟΥΣ καὶ Ἰδαίους Δακτύλους, καὶ Τελχῖνας ἀποφαινόντων· τῶν δὲ συγγενεῖς ἀλλήλων, καὶ μικράς τινας αὐτῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορὰς διαιτλλόντων.—lib. x. p. 466. C. Edit. Paris. folio. 1620.

4. But,

4. But, fourthly and lastly, We are told, that when this genealogical history came into the hands of a certain son of Thabion, the first Hierophant on record amongst the Phœnicians, he, after having corrupted it with allegories, and intermixed physical and cosmical affections with historical (that is, made the one significative of the other) DELIVERED IT TO THE PROPHETS OF THE ORGIES, AND THE HIEROPHANTS OF THE MYSTERIES; who left it to their successors (one of which was Osiris) and to the Initiated *. So that now we have an express testimony for the fact here advanced, that this was the very *history* read to the ΕΠΟΠΤΑΙ in the celebration of the *great Mysteries*.

But one thing is too remarkable to pass by unobserved: and that is, Sanchoniatho's account of the corruption of this History with *allegories* and *physical affections*, by one of his own countrymen; and of its delivery, in that state, to the Egyptians, (for Isiris is the same as Osiris) who corrupted it still more. That the Pagan Mythology was, indeed, thus corrupted, I have shewn at large, in several parts of this work: but I believe, not so early as is here pretended; which makes me suspect that Sanchoniatho lived in a later age than his interpreter, Philo, assigns to him. And what confirms me in this suspicion, is that mark of national vanity and partiality, common to aftertimes, in making the *Mysteries* of his own country original, and conveyed from Phœnicia to Egypt. Whereas it is very certain, they came first from Egypt. But of this

* Ταῦτα πάλιν ὁ Θαβίωνος παῖς, τῷ τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος γεγονότων Φοινίκων ἱεροφάντης ἀλληγορήσας, τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν ἀναμίξας παρέδωκε τοῖς ΟΡΓΙΩΣΙ καὶ ΤΕΛΕΤΩΝ καὶ ἀρχεσι ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙΣ. οἱ δὲ τὸν τύφον αὔξειν ἐπ παιδὸς ἐπινοῦντες, τοῖς αὐτῶν διαδόκοις παρέδωσαν καὶ τοῖς ἐπεισάκτοις. ᾧ εἷς ἦν Ἴσιρις.

elsewhere.

elsewhere. However, let the reader take notice, that the question concerning the *antiquity* of Sanchoniatho does not at all affect our inference concerning the nature and use of this History *.

We now come to the HYMN celebrating the Unity of the Godhead, which was sung in the *Eleusinian Mysteries* by the Hierophant, habited like the CREATOR †. And this, I take ‡ to be the little ORPHIC poem quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus § and Eusebius ‖; which begins thus: "I will declare a SECRET "to the Initiated; but let the doors be shut against "the profane. But thou, O Musæus, the offspring "of bright Selene, attend carefully to my song; for "I shall deliver the truth without disguise. Suffer

* See note [H] at the end of this Book.

† Ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατ' ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΑ μυστηρίοις, ὁ μὲν Ἱεροφάντης εἰς εἰκόνα τῷ δημιουργῷ ἐνσκευάζεται. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. iii. A passage in Porphyry well explains this of Eusebius, and shews by what kind of personage the *Creator* was represented; and that this, like all the rest, was of Egyptian original; and introduced into these secret mysteries, for the reason above explained. Τὰ δὲ τῶν ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΩΝ πάλιν τοιαῦτά φησιν ἔχειν σύμβολα. Τὸν ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΟΝ, ὃν Κνὴφ, οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι προσαγορεύουσιν ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΕΙΔΗ, τὴν δὲ χροιὰν ἐκ κυανοῦ μέλανα ἔχοντα, καλοῦντα ζώνην καὶ σκῆπτρον· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς, πτερὸν βασίλειον περικείμενον, ΟΤΙ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΔΥΣΕΥΡΕΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΕΚΡΥΜΕΝΟΣ, ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΦΑΝΟΣ, καὶ ὅτι ζωοποιὸς, καὶ ὅτι βασιλεὺς, καὶ ὅτι νοερῶς κινεῖται· διὸ ἡ τοῦ πτεροῦ φύσις ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κεῖται. Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. iii. cap. 11.

‡ M. Voltaire, in his remarks on his fine Tragedy of Olympia, has done me the honour of advancing this conjecture into a certainty; and what is more, of a known and acknowledged fact. "On chantait (says he) *l'Hymne de Orphée*"—and then gives it as he finds it here.——

§ Admonitio ad gentes, pag. 36. B. Edit. Sylburgh.

‖ Præp. Evang. lib. xiii.

"not,

" not, therefore, thy former prejudices to debar thee of " that happy life, which the knowledge of these sub- " lime truths will procure unto thee: but carefully " contemplate this divine Oracle, and preserve it in " purity of mind and heart. Go on, in the right way, " and contemplate THE SOLE GOVERNOR OF THE " WORLD: HE IS ONE, AND OF HIMSELF ALONE; " AND TO THAT ONE ALL THINGS OWE THEIR " BEING. HE OPERATES THROUGH ALL, WAS " NEVER SEEN BY MORTAL EYES, BUT DOES " HIMSELF SEE EVERY ONE *."

The reasons which support my conjecture are these: 1. We learn from the scholiast on Aristophanes and others, that hymns were sung in the mysteries, and what were the subject of them. And Dion. Chrys. in his Oration De divina Civitate aut Gubernatione, says expressly, that in the Mithriac Mysteries the Magi sung an awful Hymn in which the glories of the supreme God who governs all things were celebrated †—And further says, that this knowledge of the *One supreme* was kept a SECRET amongst the *initiated* Persians.

* Φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐςι, θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βεβήλοις
Πᾶσίν ὁμῶς, σὺ δ' ἄκυς· φαεσφόρυ ἔκγονε μήνης,
Μυσαῖ, ἐξερέω γὰρ ἀληθέα, μηδέ σε τὰ πρὶν
Ἐν ςήθεσσι φανέντα φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμέρση·
Εἰς δὲ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας, τύτῳ προσέδρευε,
Ἰθύνων κραδίης νοερὸν κύτος· εὖ δ' ἐπίβαινε
Ἀτραπιτῦ, μῦνον δ' ἐσόρα κόσμοιο ἄνακτα.
Εἷς δ' ἔς' αὐτογενὴς, ἑνὸς ἔκγονα πάντα τέτυκται,
Ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς περινίσσεται· ὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
Εἰσοράα θνητῶν, αὐτὸς δέ γε πάντας ὁρᾶται.

† μῦθος ἐν ἀπορρήτοις τελεταῖς ὑπὸ Μάγων ἀνθρῶν ἄδεται Θαυμαζόμενος. οἱ τὸν θεὸν τῦτον ὕμνυσιν ὧς τελείοντε καὶ πρῶτον ἡνίοχον τῦ τελειοτάτυ ἅρματος.

2. Orpheus,

2. Orpheus, as we have said, first brought the *Mysteries* from Egypt into Thrace, and even religion itself: hence it was called Θρησκεία, as being supposed the invention of the Thracian. 3. The verses, which go under the name of Orpheus, are, at least, more ancient than Plato and Herodotus; though since interpolated. It was the common opinion, that they were genuine; and those who doubted of that, yet gave them to the earliest Pythagoreans *. 4. The subject of them are the *Mysteries*, under the several titles of † Θρονισμοὶ μήτρῳοι τελεταὶ, ἱερὸς λόγος, and ἡ εἰς ᾅδου καταβασις. 5. Pausanias tells us, that Orpheus's hymns were sung in the rites of Ceres, in preference to Homer's though more elegant, for the reasons given above ‡. 6. This hymn is addressed to Musæus, his disciple, who was said, though falsely, to institute the *Mysteries* at Athens, as his master had done in Thrace §; and begins with the *formula* used by the Mystagogue on that occasion, warning the PROPHANE to keep at distance: and in the fourth line, mentions that *new life* or *regeneration*, to which the Initiated were taught to aspire. 7. No other original than singing the hymns

* Laertius in Vita Pythag. and Suidas, voce Ὀρφεύς.

† The following passage of Dion. Chrys. will explain the meaning of this Θρονισμὸς—Καθάπερ εἰώθασιν ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ ΘΡΟΝΙΣΜΩ, καθίσαντες τὸν μυούμενον οἱ τελοῦντες, κύκλῳ περιχορεύειν. Orat. xii.

‡ Ὅσοις δὲ περὶ ποιήσεως ἐπολυπραγμόνησεν, ἤδη τοὺς Ὀρφέως ὕμνους οἶδεν ὅλως, ἕκαστόν τε αὐτῶν, ἐπὶ βραχύταλον, καὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἐκ ἐς ἀριθμὸν πολὺν πεποιημένους. Λυκομῆδαι δὲ ἴσασί τε καὶ ἐπᾴδουσι τοῖς δρωμένοις· κόσμῳ μὲν δὴ τῶν ἐπῶν δουλειοτέρα φέροιντο ἄν, μετὰ Ὁμήρου γε τοὺς ὕμνους· τιμῆς δὲ ἕκ τοῦ θείου καὶ πλέον ἐκείνων ἔχουσι. Pausan. lib. ix. cap. 30. sub fin. pag. 770. Edit. Kuhnii, fol. Lips. 1696. and again, to the same purpose, cap. 27.

§ Tertull. Apol.

of

of Orpheus in the *Eleusinian Mysteries*, can be well imagined of that popular opinion, mentioned by Theodoret, that Orpheus instituted *those Mysteries**, when the Athenians had such certain records of another Founder. 8. We are told that one article of the Athenians' charge against Diagoras for revealing the *Mysteries*, was his making the *Orphic-speech*, or hymn, the subject of his common conversation †. 9. But lastly, the account, which Clemens gives of this hymn, seems to put the matter out of question: his words are these: "But the Thracian Mystagogue, who was at "the same time a poet, *Orpheus*, the son of Oeager, "after he had opened the *Mysteries*, and sung the "whole THEOLOGY OF IDOLS, recants all he had said, "and introduceth TRUTH. The Sacreds then truly "begin, though late, and thus he enters upon the "matter ‡." To understand the force of this passage, we are to know, that the Mystagogue explained the representations in the *Mysteries*; where, as we learn from Apuleius §, the supernal and infernal Gods passed in review. To each of these they sung an hymn; which Clemens calls the *theology of images*, or *idols*. These are yet to be seen amongst the works ascribed

* See † note, p. 3.

† Διαγόρα μὲν γὰρ εἰκότως ἐνεκάλȣν Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ μόνον τὸν ΟΡΦΙΚΟΝ εἰς μέσον κατατιθέντι ΛΟΓΟΝ, καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, καὶ τὰ τῶν Καβείρων δημεύοντι μυςήρια. Athenagoras in Legat.

‡ Ὁ δὲ Θρᾴκιος ἱεροφάντης καὶ ποιητὴς ἅμα, ὁ τȣ̃ Οἰάγρȣ Ὀρφεὺς, μετὰ τὴν τῶν Ὀργίων ἱεροφαντίαν, καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν θεολογίαν, παλινῳδίαν ἀληθείας εἰσάγει, τὸν ἱερὸν ὄντως ὀψέ ποτε, ὅμως δ' ȣ̃ν ᾄδων λόγον. Admon. ad Gentes, pag. 36. A. Edit. Sylburgh.

§ Accessi consinium mortis, deos inferos, & deos superos accessi coram, & adoravi de proximo. Met. lib. xi. p. 1000. circa finem. Edit. Lugd. 1587. 8vo.

to

to Orpheus. When all this was over, then came the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, delivered in the ΗΥΜΝ in question. And, after that, the Assembly was dismissed, with these two barbarous words, ΚΟΓΞ ΟΜΠΑΞ, which shews the *Mysteries* not to have been originally Greek. The learned Mr. Le Clerc well observes, that this seems to be only an ill pronunciation of *kots* and *omphets*, which, he tells us, signify in the Phœnician tongue, *watch and abstain from evil**.

Thus the reader is brought acquainted with the end and use both of the *greater* and *lesser Mysteries*; and sees that, as well in what they *hid*, as in what they *divulged*, all aimed at the benefit of the State. To this end, they were to draw in as many as they could to their general participation; which they did by spreading abroad the doctrine of a Providence, and a future state; and how much happier the Initiated should be, and what superior felicities they were intitled to, in another life. It was on this account that Antiquity is so full and express in this part. But then, they were to make those, they had got in, as virtuous as was possible; which they did, by discovering, to such as were judged capable of the *secret*, the whole delusion of Polytheism. Now this being supposed the shaking of foundations, was to be done with all possible circumspection, and under the most tremendous seal of secrecy†. For they taught, that the Gods themselves punished the *revealers of the* SECRET; and not them only, but the *hearers* of it likewise‡. Nor did they altogether

* Bibl. Univ. tom. vi. p. 86.

† See cap. 20. of Meursius's Eleusinia.

‡ — Quæras forsitan satis anxie, studiose lector, quid deinde dictum, quid factum? Dicerem, si *dicere* liceret; cognosceres, si

altogether trust to that alone: for, more effectually to curb an ungovernable curiosity, the State decreed capital punishment against the betrayers of the *Mysteries*, and inflicted it with merciless severity*. The case of Diagoras, the Melian, is too remarkable to be omitted. This man had revealed the *Orphic* and *Eleusinian Mysteries:* and so, passed with the people for an Atheist: which at once confirms what hath been said of the object of the *secret doctrines*, and of the mischief which would attend an indiscreet communication of them. For the charge of ATHEISM was the common lot of all those who communicated their knowledge of the *one only God*; whether they learnt it by natural light, or were afterwards taught it by *Revelation*. He likewise dissuaded his friends from being initiated into these rites: the consequence of which was, that the city of Athens proscribed him, and set a price upon his head †. While Socrates, who preached up the latter part of this doctrine (and was on that account a reputed Atheist likewise) and Epicurus, who taught the former (and was a real one) were suffered, because they delivered their opinions only as points of philosophic speculation, amongst their followers, to live a long time unmolested. And to avoid the danger of those laws, which secured the *secret* of the Mysteries, was perhaps the reason why Socrates declined initiation.

liceret *audire*; sed parem noxam contraherent *aures & linguæ temeratæ curiositatis*. Apul. Met. lib. xi. p. 1000. Edit. Lugd. 8vo, 1587.

* Si quis arcanæ mysteria Cereris sacra vulgâsset, lege morti addicebatur. Τὸν ἐξειπόντα τὰ μυστήρια τεθνάναι. Meminit hujus legis Sopater in Divisione quæstionis. Sam. Petit. in Leges Atticas, p. 33.

† Suidas, voce Διαγόρας; ὁ Μήλιος ——— & etiam Athenagoras in Legatione.

tion*. And this appearing a singular affectation, exposed him to much censure†. But he declined it with his usual prudence. He remembered, that Æschylus‡, on a mere imagination of his having given a hint of something in the *Mysteries*, had like to have been torn in pieces on the stage by the people; and only escaped by an appeal to the Areopagus: which venerable Court acquitted him of this dangerous charge, on his proving that he had never been initiated. The famous EUHEMERUS, who assumed the same office of Hierophant to the People at large, with more boldness than Socrates, and more temper than Epicurus, employed another expedient to screen himself from the laws, though he fell, and not (like the rest) undeservedly §, under the same imputation of *Atheism*. This man gave a fabulous relation of a voyage to the imaginary island of Panchæa ‖, a kind of ancient Utopia; where, in a temple of Jupiter, he found a genealogical record, which discovered to him the births and deaths of the greater Gods; and, in short, every thing that the Hierophant revealed to the Initiated on this subject. Thus he too avoided the suspicion of a *betrayer of the Mysteries*. A character infamous in social life. And to this the Son of Sirach alludes, where he speaks of this species of infidelity in general ¶—

* For that he had a good opinion of the *Mysteries* appears from the *Phædo* of Plato.

† Κατηγορεῖτε—ἔτε ἐμυήθη μόνος ἀπάντων ταῖς Ἐλευσινίαις. Lucianus, Demonacte, T. II. p. 380. Edit. Reitzii, 4to. Amstel. 1743.

‡ Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. pag. 283. B. Edit. Sylburg. & Arist. lib. iii. cap. 1. Nicom. Eth.

§ See note [I] at the end of this Book.

‖ Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ii. cap. 2.

¶ ὁ ἀποκαλύπλων ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΑ, ἀπόλεσε πίστιν, καὶ ὃ μὴ εὕρῃ φίλον πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτε. Cap. xxvii. ver. 17.

" Whoso discovereth SECRETS [μυστήρια], loseth his " credit, and shall never find friend to his mind." This, therefore, is the reason why so little is to be met with, concerning the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ. Varro and Cicero, the two most inquisitive persons in antiquity, affording but a glimmering light. The *first* giving us a short account of the *cause* only of the SECRET, without mentioning the *doctrine*; and the *other*, a hint of the *doctrine*, without mentioning the *cause*.

But now a remarkable exception to all we have been saying, concerning the *secrecy* of the *Mysteries*, obtrudes itself upon us, in the case of the CRETANS; who, as Diodorus Siculus assures us, celebrated their *Mysteries* OPENLY, and taught their ἀπόῤῥητα without reserve. His words are these: " At Cnossus in Crete, " it was provided for, by an ancient law, that these " *Mysteries* should be shewn openly to all: and that " those things, which in other places were delivered in " secret, should be hid from none who were desirous " of knowing them*." But, as contrary as this seems to the principles delivered above, it will be found, on attentive reflection, altogether to confirm them. We have shewn, that the *great secret* was the detection of Polytheism; which was done by teaching the original of the Gods; their birth from mortals; and their advancement to divine honour, for benefits done to their Country, or Mankind. But it is to be observed, that the Cretans proclaimed this to all the world, by shewing, and boasting of the tomb of Jupiter himself, the *Father of Gods and Men*. How then could they tell that as a

* Καλὰ δὲ τὴν Κρήτην ἐν Κνωσσῷ νόμιμον ἐξ ἀρχαίων εἶναι φανερῶς τὰς τελετὰς ταύτας πᾶσι παραδίδοσθαι, καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν ἀπορῥήτῳ παραδεδομένα, παρ' αὐτοῖς μηδένα κρύπτειν τῶν βουλομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα γινώσκειν. Biblioth. lib. v.

secret

secret in their *Mysteries*, which they told to every one out of them? Nor is it less remarkable that the Cretans themselves, as Diodorus, in the same place, tells us, gave this very circumstance of their celebrating the *Mysteries openly* as a proof of their being the first who had consecrated dead mortals. " These are the old " stories which the Cretans tell of their Gods, who, " they pretend to say, were born amongst them. And " they urge this as an invincible reason to prove that the " adoration, the worship, and the MYSTERIES of these " Gods were first derived from Crete to the rest of " the world; for, whereas, amongst the Athenians, " those most illustrious *Mysteries* of all, called the " *Eleusinian*, those of Samothrace, and those of the " Ciconians in Thrace, of Orpheus's institution, are " all celebrated in SECRET: yet in Crete*"——and so on as above. For it seems the Cretans were proud of their invention; and used this method to proclaim and perpetuate the notice of it. So when Pythagoras, as Porphyry † informs us, had been initiated into the *Cretan mysteries*, and had continued in the *Idean* cave three times nine days, he wrote this epigram on the tomb of Jupiter,

Ὧδε θανὼν κεῖται Ζᾶν, ὃν Δία κικλήσκουσιν.

Zan, whom men call Jupiter, lies here deceased.

* Περὶ μὲν ὧν τῶν θεῶν οἱ Κρῆτες τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς λεγομένων γεννηθῆναι τοιαῦτα μυθολογοῦσι· τὰς δὲ τιμὰς καὶ θυσίας καὶ τὰς περὶ τὰ μυστήρια τελετὰς ἐκ Κρήτης εἰς τὰς ἄλλας ἀνθρώπους παραδεδόσθαι λέγοντες, τοῦτο φέρουσιν, ὡς οἴονται, μέγιστον τεκμήριον· τηλε γὰρ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι γινομένην τελετὴν, ἐπιφανεστάτην σχεδὸν οὖσαν ἁπασῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐν Σαμοθρᾴκῃ, καὶ τὴν ἐν Θρᾴκῃ ἐν τοῖς Κικοσιν (ὅθεν ὁ καλλιδείξας Ὀρφεὺς ἦν) μυστικῶς παραδίδοσθαι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Κρήτην——

† De vita Pythag. n. xvii.

It was this which so much exasperated the other Grecians against them; and gave birth to the common proverb of ΚΡΗΤΕΣ ΑΕΙ ΨΕΥΣΤΑΙ *, *The Cretans are eternal liars.* For nothing could more affront these superstitious idolaters than asserting the fact, or more displease the politic protectors of the *Mysteries* than the divulging it †.

The MYSTERIES then being of so great service to the state, we shall not be surprized to hear the wisest of the Ancients speaking highly in their commendation; and their ablest Lawgivers, and reformers, providing carefully for their support. "Ceres (says Isocrates) "hath made the Athenians two presents of the greatest "consequence: corn, which brought us out of a state "of brutality; and the MYSTERIES, which teach the "initiated to entertain the most agreeable expectations "touching death and eternity ‡." And Plato introduceth Socrates speaking after this manner; "In my "opinion, those who established the MYSTERIES, "whoever they were, were well skilled in human nature. "For in these rites it was of old signified to the as-"pirants, that those who died without being initiated,

* Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται· κὴ ΓΑΡ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, σεῖο
Κρῆτες ἐτεκλήναλο. Callim. Hymn. in Jovem.

And Nonnus;

Οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ παρέμιμνε Διὸς ΨΕΥΔΗΜΟΝΙ ΤΥΜΒΩι.
Τεσπομένη Κρήτεσσιν, ἐπεὶ πέλον ἠπεροπῆες. Dionys. lib. viii.

And Lucan;

Tam mendax Magni tumulo, quam Creta Tonantis. lib. viii.

† See note [K] at the end of this Book.

‡ Δήμητρος —— δόσης δωρεὰς, διττὰς, αἵπερ μέγιστα τυγχάνουσιν ὄσαι· τάς τε καρπὰς οἱ τῷ μὴ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἡμᾶς αἴτιοι γεγόνασι, κὴ τὴν τελεῖην, ἧς οἱ μετέχοντες περί τε τῆς τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς, κὴ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰῶνος ἡδίους τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχουσιν. Panegyr.

"stuck

" stuck fast in mire and filth: but that he who was " purified and initiated, should, at his death, have his " habitation with the Gods *." And Tully thought them of such use to Society, for preserving and propagating the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, that in the law where he forbids nocturnal sacrifices offered by women, he makes an express exception for the *Mysteries* of Ceres, as well as for the sacrifices to the GOOD GODDESS. " Nocturna mu- " lierum sacrificia ne sunto, præter olla, quæ pro " populo rite fiant. Neve quem initianto, nisi, ut " assolet, Cereri, Græco sacro." Which law he thus comments:— " *M.* But now, Titus, as to what follows, " I would fain know how you can give your assent, or " I blame you for withholding it? *A.* What is that, I " pray you? *M.* The law concerning the nocturnal " sacrifices of women. *A.* I assent to it, especially as " there is an express exception to the public and so- " lemn sacrifice. *M.* What then will become of our " *Eleusinian Rites*, those reverend and august *Mys-* " *teries*, if, indeed, we take away nocturnal celebrations? " *For our laws are calculated, not only for the Roman,* " *but for all just and well established policies.* *A.* I " think you except those, into which we ourselves have " been initiated. *M.* Doubtless I do: for as, in my " opinion, your Athens hath produced many excellent " and even divine inventions, and applied them to the " use of life: so has she given nothing better than " those *Mysteries*, by which we are drawn from an " irrational and savage life, and tamed, as it were,

* Καὶ κινδυνεύουσι καὶ οἱ τὰς τελετὰς ἡμῖν ἔτοι καταστήσαντες, οὐ φαῦλοί τινες εἶναι ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι πάλαι αἰνίττεσθαι, ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀμύητος, καὶ ἀτέλεστος, εἰς ᾅδου ἀφίκεται, ἐν βορβόρῳ κείσεται· ὁ δὲ κεκαθαρμένος τε καὶ τετελεσμένος, ἔκεισε ἀφικόμενος, μετὰ θεῶν οἰκήσει. In Phædone.

" and broken to humanity. They are truly called " INITIA, for they are indeed the beginnings of a life " of reason and virtue. From whence we not only " receive the benefits of a more comfortable and " elegant subsistence here, but are taught to *hope for*, " *and aspire to a better life hereafter*. But what it is " that displeases me in nocturnal rites, the comic poets " will shew you *. Which liberty of celebration, " had it been permitted at Rome, what wickedness " would not HE † have attempted, who came with a " premeditated purpose of indulging his lust, to a " Sacrifice where even the misbehaviour ‡ of the eye " was deeply criminal §."

* See note [L] at the end of this Book.

† See note [M] at the end of this Book.

‡ The Ancients esteemed *that* to be the greatest misbehaviour of the eye, where the sight of *men* obtruded, though only by accident, upon those *Mysteries*, which it was only lawful for *women* to behold.

§ *M.* At vero, quod sequitur, quomodo aut tu assentiare, aut ego reprehendam, sane quære. Tite. *A.* Quid tandem id est? *M.* De nocturnis sacrificiis mulierum. *A.* Ego vero assentior, excepto præsertim in ipsa lege solemni sacrificio ac publico. *M.* Quid ergo aget Iacchus Eumolpidæque vestri [nostri *alii*], & augusta illa mysteria, siquidem sacra nocturna tollimus? non enim populo Romano, sed omnibus bonis firmisque populis leges damus. *A.* Excipis, credo, illa, quibus ipsi initiati sumus. *M.* Ego vero excipiam. Nam mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur Athenæ tuæ peperisse, atque in vita hominum attulisse, tum nihil melius illis mysteriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem, & mitigati sumus; *initiaque*, ut appellantur, ita revera principia vitæ cognovimus; neque solum cum lætitia vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum spe meliore moriendi. Quid autem mihi displiceat IN NOCTURNIS, Poëtæ indicant Comici. Qua licentia Romæ data, quidnam egisset ille, qui in sacrificium cogitatam libidinem intulit, quo ne imprudentiam quidem oculorum adjici fas fuit? De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 14. Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 148, 49.

We

We have seen, that the other exception to this law against nocturnal sacrifices, was in favour of the rites performed to the GOOD GODDESS, called *the public and solemn sacrifice*. This was offered *pro populo*, for the safety of the people. So that Cicero, ranking the *Eleusinian* with these rites, appears to have thought them in the number of such as were celebrated for the public safety. Solon, the famous lawgiver of Athens, long before him, had the same high opinion of these *Mysteries*, as is seen by the care he took of their regulation; and so had Prætextatus, a most accomplished Roman Magistrate, long after him: For when his master, Valentinian, had divided the Empire with his brother, and projected a general reform of the laws, and, amongst the rest, had forbid NOCTURNAL SACRIFICES; he was persuaded by Prætextatus, who governed for him in Greece, to make an exception for the *Mysteries of Ceres*; which had been brought to Rome very early *, and incorporated into the national worship †, and long afterwards regulated anew by the wise emperor Hadrian ‡.

Zosimus tells the story in this manner: "The supreme power being thus divided, Valentinian entered "on his new command with a more serious attention "to his office. He reformed the Magistracy, he re-"gulated the Revenue, and, by a rigid exaction of

* As appears by Tully's Oration for Corn. Balbus, and by a passage in his second Book, cap. 24. Of the nature of the Gods, quoted above; and likewise from Dionys. Hal. lib. i. cap. 33. Antiq. Ἱδρύσαντο δὲ καὶ Δήμητρος ἱερὸν, καὶ τὰς θυσίας αὐτῇ διὰ γυναικῶν τε καὶ νηφαλίους ἔθυσαν, ὡς Ἕλλησι νόμος, ὧν ἐδέησεν ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἤλαττε χρόνος.

† Suetonius, Vita Aug. cap. 93. T. I. p. 354. Edit. Pitisci, 1714, 4to.

‡ Aurel. Victor. in Hadr.

"the

" the Duties, secured the pay of the soldiery, which " arose out of that fund: and having determined " likewise to new model and promulge the imperial " Institutes, *beginning*, as they say, from the founda- " tion, he forbad the celebration of all NOCTURNAL " rites and sacrifices; with design to obviate the enor- " mities which the opportunity of these seasons gave " birth to, and enflamed. But when Prætextatus, a " man adorned with every virtue both of public and " private life, who then governed Greece in quality of " proconsul, had given him to understand that this " law would occasion great disorders in Greece, and " even throw the inhabitants into despair, when they " should find that they were forbidden to celebrate, " according to ancient custom, those most holy *Mys-* " *teries*, which had now taken in the whole race of " mankind, he gave leave to a suspension of his law, " with regard to These; on condition, however, that " every thing should be reduced to the primitive purity " and simplicity*." Thus the ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES got a reprieve, till the reign of Theodosius the elder, when they were finally abolished. The terms Prætextatus used to shew the ill consequence of the

* Τῆς τοίνον ἀρχῆς οὕτω διαιρεθείσης ὁ Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ἐμβριθέστερον τῇ ἀρχῇ προσελθὼν, ἄρχοντάς τε ἐν κόσμῳ προῆγεν, καὶ περὶ τὰς εἰσπράξεις τῶν εἰσφορῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐκ τούτων χορηγουμένας στρατιωτικὰς σιτήσεις, ἀκριβέστατος ἦν· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ νόμων εἰσφορὰς ἐγνώκει ποιήσασθαι, ἀφ' ἑστίας ὥσπερ ἀρξάμενος, τὰς νυκτερινὰς ἐκώλυε θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, τοῖς μυσαρῶς μὲν οὖν πραττομένοις ἐμποδὼν διὰ τοῦ τοιοῦδε νόμου γενέσθαι βειλόμενος· ἐπεὶ δὲ Πραιτεξτάτος, ὁ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν ἀνθύπατον ἔχων ἀρχὴν, ἀνὴρ ἐν πάσαις διαπρέπων ταῖς ἀρεταῖς, τοῦτον ἔφη τὸν νόμον ΑΒΙΩΤΟΝ τοῖς Ἕλλησι καταστήσειν τὸν ΒΙΟΝ, εἰ μέλλοιεν κωλύεσθαι τὰ συνέχοντα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος ἁγιώτατα μυστήρια κατὰ θεσμὸν ἐκτελεῖν ἐπέτρεψεν, ἀργοῦντος τοῦ νόμου· πράττεσθαι δὲ πάντα κατὰ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πάτρια. Lib. iv. Hist. Novæ.

suppression,

suppression, are very remarkable: he said, the Greeks would, from thenceforth, lead ΑΒΙΩΤΟΝ ΒΙΟΝ, *a comfortless lifeless life*. But this could not be said, with any truth, or propriety, of the taking away a mere religious rite, how venerable soever it was become by its antiquity. To apprehend the force of the expression, we must have in mind what hath been said of the doctrines taught in those Rites, namely, a *Providence*, and a *future state of rewards and punishments*, on whose sole account the Rites were instituted. Now these doctrines being in themselves of the most engaging nature; taught here in the most interesting manner; and receiving from hence their chief credit; it was no wonder that the Greeks should esteem the abolition of the MYSTERIES as the greatest evil: the life of man being, indeed, without the comfort and support of these doctrines, no better than a *living death:* hence it was, that the sage Isocrates called the MYSTERIES, *the thing, human nature principally stands in need of* *. And that Aristides said, *the welfare of Greece was secured by the Eleusinian Mysteries alone* †. Indeed the Greeks seemed to place their chief happiness in them: so Euripides makes Hercules say ‡, *I was blest when I got a sight of the mysteries:* and it was a proverbial speech, when any one thought himself in the highest degree happy, to say, *I seem as if I had been initiated in the higher mysteries* §.

1. But now, such is the fate of human things, These MYSTERIES, venerable as they were, in their first in-

* Οὗ πρῶτον ἡ φύσις ἡμῶν ἐδεήθη. Panegyr.

† μόνοις Ἐλευσινίοις ὑγίαινεν ἡ Ἑλλάς. Eleus.

‡ Τὰ μυσῶν δ' ὄρφ εὐτύχησ' ἰδών. Herc. furens, ver. 613.

§ Ἐποπτεύειν μοι δοκῶ.

stitution,

stitution, did, it must be owned, in course of time, fearfully degenerate; and those very provisions made by the State, to enable the *Mysteries* to obtain the end of their establishment, became the very means of defeating it. For we can assign no surer CAUSE of the horrid abuses and corruptions of the *Mysteries* (besides time, which naturally and fatally depraves and vitiates all things) than the SEASON in which they were represented; and the profound SILENCE in which they were buried. For NIGHT gave opportunity to wicked men to attempt evil actions; and SECRECY, encouragement to perpetrate them; and the inviolable nature of that secrecy, which encouraged abuses, kept them from the Magistrate's knowledge so long, till it was too late to reform them. In a word, we must own, that these *Mysteries*, so powerful in their first institution for the promotion of VIRTUE and KNOWLEDGE *, became, in time, horribly subservient to the gratification of LUST and REVENGE †. Nor will this appear at all strange after what hath been said above. A like corruption, from the same cause, crept even into the CHURCH, during the purest ages of it. The primitive christians, in *imitation*, perhaps, of these pagan rites, or from the *same kind of spirit*, had a custom of celebrating VIGILS in the night; which, at first, were performed with all becoming sanctity: but, in a little time, they were so overrun with abuses, that it was necessary to abolish them. The account Bellarmine

* —— Τὰ μυςήρια—ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ καὶ ἐπανορθώσει τοῦ βίου κατεςάθη πάντα ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν.

† Ἢ γὰρ τεκνοφόνους ΤΕΛΕΤΑΣ, ἢ ΚΡΥΦΙΑ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΑ, ἢ ἐμμανεῖς ἐξ ἄλλων θεσμῶν κώμους ἄγοντες, Οὔτε βίους οὔτε γάμους καθαροὺς ἔτι φυλάσσουσιν, ἕτερος δ' ἕτερον ἢ ΛΟΧΩΝ ΑΝΑΙΡΕΙ, ἢ ΝΟΘΕΥΩΝ ΟΔΥΝΑ. Wisdom of Solomon, xiv. 23, 24.

gives

gives of the matter, is this: "Quoniam occasione "nocturnarum vigiliarum abusus quidam irrepere "cœperant, vel potius flagitia non raro committi, "placuit ecclesiæ nocturnos conventus & vigilias "proprie dictas intermittere, ac solum in iisdem "diebus celebrare jejunia *." And the same remedy, Cicero † tells us, Diagondas the Theban was forced to apply to the disorders of the *Mysteries*.

2. However, this was not the only, though it was the most powerful cause of the depravation of the *Mysteries*. Another doubtless was their being sometimes under the patronage of those Deities, who were supposed to inspire and preside over sensual passions, such as Bacchus, Venus, and Cupid; for these had all their *Mysteries*: And where was the wonder, if the *Initiated* should be sometimes inclined to give a loose to those vices, in which the patron God was supposed to delight? And in this case, the HIDDEN DOCTRINE came too late to put a stop to the disorder. However, it is remarkable, and confirms what hath been said concerning the origin of the *Mysteries*, and of their being invented to perpetuate the doctrine of a future state, that this doctrine continued to be taught even in the most debauched celebrations of the Mysteries of Cupid ‡ and Bacchus §. Nay, even that very flagitious part

* De Eccl. Triumph. lib. iii. cap. ult.

† — Atque omnia nocturna, ne nos duriores forte videamur, in media Græcia Diagondas Thebanus lege perpetua sustulit. De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 15. Edit. Ox. 4to. Tom. III. p. 149.

‡ Ἀγαθὸν μὲν, ὦ ἑταῖρε, τῆς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τελετῆς μετασχεῖν, ἐγὼ δὲ ὁρῶ τοῖς ΕΡΩΤΟΣ ὀρτιασταῖς καὶ μύσταις ἐν ᾅδου βελτίωνα μοῖραν οὖσαν. Plutarchus Ἐρωτικῶ.

§ Κέλσος — οἴεταί γε ἐπὶ θάμβει τῶν ἰδιωτῶν ταῦθ' ἡμᾶς ποιεῖν, οὐχὶ δὲ τάληθῆ περὶ κολάσεων λέγοντας ἀναγκαίων τοῖς ἡμαρτηκόσι· διόπερ ἐξομοῖοι

part of the mysterious rites when at worst, *the carrying the* ΚΤΕΙΣ *and* ΦΑΛΛΟΣ *in procession*, was introduced but under pretence of their being *emblems** of the mystical regeneration and new life, into which the Initiated had engaged themselves to enter.

3. The last *cause* to which one may ascribe their corruption, was the Hierophant's withdrawing the *Mysteries* from the care and inspection of the civil Magistrate; whose original Institution they were: and, therefore, in the purer ages of Greece, the deputies

ἐξομοῖοι ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἐν ταῖς ΒΑΚΧΙΚΑΙΣ τελεταῖς τὰ φάσματα καὶ δείματα προεισάγουσι. Orig. contra Celsum, lib. iv. p. 167. Sp.

* Καὶ γὰρ αἱ τελεταὶ, καὶ τὰ ὄργια, τὰ τέτων εἶχεν ΑΙΝΙΓΜΑΤΑ. τὴν κλέιν μὲν ἡ Ἐλευσὶς, ἡ φαλλαγωγία δὲ τὸν Φαλλόν. Theodoret, Therapeut. lib. i. Here the father uses the word αἰνίγματα ironically, and in derision of the Pagans, who pretended, that these processions were mystical, symbolical, and enigmatical; otherwise he had used the word improperly; for the κλεὶς and φαλλὸς could never be the αἰνίγματα of the pollutions committed by them: αἴνισμα signifying the obscure imitation of a thing represented by a *different* image.—So Tertullian against the Valentinians says, "Virile membrum totum esse MYSTERIUM." Jamblichus gives another reason for these things: διὰ τέτο ἔν τε κωμῳδίᾳ καὶ τραγῳδίᾳ ἀλλότρια πάθη θεωροῦντες, ἴσαμεν τὰ οἰκεῖα πάθη, καὶ μελιώτερα ἀπεργαζόμεθα, καὶ ἀπικαθαίρομεν· ἔν τε τοῖς ἱεροῖς, θεάμασί τισι καὶ ἀκέσμασι τῶν αἰσχρῶν, ἀπολυόμεθα τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀπ' αὐτῶν συμπιπλέσης βλάβης. De mysteriis, § i. cap. 11. However, in common life, *figuram pudendi virilis ad fascini omne genus expugnandum multum valere crederent.* A superstition, which, without doubt, arose from its *enigmatic* station in the *mysteries*; and to this day keeps its hold amongst the common people in Italy.—On les portoit comme des préservatifs contre les charmes, les mauvais regards & les enchantements.—Cette practique superstitieuse ne s'en est pas moins conservée jusqu'à present dans le bas Peuple du Royaume de Naples. L'on m'a fait voir plusieurs de ces Priapes, que des gens ont la simplicité de porter au bras ou sur la poitrine. Winkelman sur les decouvertes d'Herculaneum, p. 41.

ties of the States presided in them: and, so long, they were safe from notorious abuses. But in aftertimes it would happen, that a little priest, who had borne an inferior share in these rites, would leave his society and country, and set up for himself; and in a clandestine manner, without the allowance or knowledge of the Magistrate, institute and celebrate the *Mysteries* in private Conventicles. From rites so managed it is easy to believe, many enormities would arise. This was the original of those horrid impieties committed in the *Mysteries of Bacchus* at Rome; of which the historian Livy has given so circumstantial an account: for, in the beginning of his story, he tells us, the mischief was occasioned by one of these priests bringing the *Mysteries* into Etruria, on his own head, uncommissioned by his superiors in Greece, from whom he learnt them; and unauthorized by the State, into which he had introduced them. The words of Livy shew that the *Mysteries* were, in their own nature, a very different affair; and invented for the improvement of Knowledge and Virtue. "A Greek "of mean extraction (says he*) a little priest and "soothsayer, came first into Etruria, WITHOUT ANY "SKILL OR WISDOM IN MYSTERIOUS RITES, MANY "SORTS OF WHICH, THAT MOST IMPROVED PEOPLE "HAVE BROUGHT IN AMONGST US, FOR THE "CULTURE AND PERFECTION BOTH OF MIND "AND BODY †." It is farther observable, that this priest

* Græcus ignobilis in Etruriam primum venit, NULLA CUM ARTE EARUM, QUAS MULTAS AD ANIMORUM CORPORUMQUE CULTUM NOBIS ERUDITISSIMA OMNIUM GENS INVEXIT, sed sacrificulus & vates. Hist. lib. xxxix.

† What Livy means by the *culture of the body*, will be seen hereafter, when we come to speak of the probationary and toil-

priest brought the *Mysteries* pure with him out of Greece, and that they received their corruption in Italy; for, as Hispala tells the story to the Consul, at first WOMEN only celebrated the Rites; till Paculla Minia Campana became priestess; who, on a sudden, as by order of the Gods, made a total alteration in the Ceremonies, and initiated her SONS; which gave occasion to all the debaucheries that followed *. The consequence of this discovery was the abolition of the *Rites of Bacchus* throughout Italy, by a decree of the Senate †.

However, it is very true, that in Greece itself the *Mysteries* became abominably abused ‡: a proof of which

some trials undergone by those *aspirants* to the *Mysteries*, called the SOLDIERS OF MITHRAS.

* Hispala's confession will fully instruct the reader in the nature and degree of these corruptions.—" Tum Hispala originem " sacrorum expromit. Primo sacrarium id fœminarum fuisse, nec " quemquam virum eo admitti solitum.—Pacullam sacerdotem " omnia, tanquam Deûm monitis, immutâsse: nam & viros eam " primam suos filios initiasse: & nocturnum sacrum ex diurno, & " pro tribus in anno diebus quinos singulis mensibus dies initiorum " fecisse. Ex quo in promiscuo sacra sint, & permisti viri fœmi- " nis, & noctis licentia accesserit; nihil ibi facinoris, nihil flagitii " prætermissum; plura virorum inter sese, quam fœminarum esse " stupra. Si qui minus patientes dedecoris sint, & pigriores ad " facinus, pro victimis immolari: nihil nefas ducere. Hanc " summam inter eos religionem esse; viros velut mente capta cum " jactatione fanatica corporis vaticinari—Raptos a Diis homines " dici, quos machinæ illigatos ex conspectu in abditos specus " abripiant; eos esse, qui aut conjurare, aut sociari facinoribus, " aut stuprum pati noluerint Multitudinem ingentem, alterum jam " prope populum esse: in his nobiles quosdam viros, fœminasque. " Biennio proximo institutum esse, ne quis major viginti annis " initiaretur; captari ætatis & erroris & stupri patientes."

† See note [N] at the end of this Book.

‡ See Clemens Alexandrinus, in his Admonitio ad Gentes.

which we have even in the conduct of their Comic writers, who frequently lay the action of the Drama (such as the rape of a young girl, and the like) at the celebration of a religious *Mystery*; and from that *Mystery* denominate the Piece *. So that, in the time of Cicero, the terms *mysteries* and *abominations* were almost synonymous. The *Academic* having said they had secrets and *Mysteries*, Lucullus replies, "Quæ "sunt tandem ista MYSTERIA? aut cur celatis, quasi "TURPE aliquid, vestram sententiam †?" However, in spite of all occasions and opportunities, some of these *Mysteries*, as the ELEUSINIAN particularly, continued for many ages pure and undefiled. The two capital corruptions of the Mysteries were MAGIC and IMPURITIES. Yet, so late as the age of Apollonius Tyan; the *Eleusinian* kept so clear of the first imputation, that the hierophant refused to initiate that impostor, because he was suspected to be a Magician ‡. And, indeed, their long-continued immunity, both from one and the other corruption, will not appear extraordinary, if we consider, that, by a law of Solon, the senate was always to meet the day after the celebration of these Mysteries, to see that nothing had been done amiss during the performance §. So that these were

* See Fabricius's Notitia comicorum deperditorum, in his first volume of the Bibl. Græc. lib. ii. cap. 22.

† Acad. Quæst. lib. i.

‡ Ὁ δὲ Ἱεροφάνης ἐκ ἐθέλειο παρέχειν τὰ ἱερὰ, μὴ γὰρ ἂν πόλε μυήσαι γόητα, μὴ δὲ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα ἀνοίξαι ἀνθρώπῳ μὴ καθαρῷ τὰ δαιμόνια, Philost. lib. iv. cap. 18.

§ ἡ γὰρ βελὴ ἐκεῖ καθεδεῖσθαι ἔμελλε, κατὰ τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον, ὃς κελεύει, τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ, τῶν μυστηρίων ἔδραν ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ. Andoc. Orat.

the very last that submitted to the common fate of all human institutions *.

It is true, if uncertain report were to be believed, the *Mysteries* were corrupted very early: for Orpheus himself is said to have abused them †. But this was a figment which the debauched *Mystæ* of later times invented to varnish over their enormities; as the detestable Pæderasts of after-ages scandalized the blameless Socrates. Besides, the story is so ill laid, that it is detected by the surest records of Antiquity: for, in consequence of the crime which they fabled Orpheus committed in the *Mysteries*, they pretended, that he was torn in pieces by the women: whereas it appeared from the inscription on his monument at Dium in Macedonia, that he was struck dead with lightning, the envied death of the reputed favourites of the Gods ‡.

And here the christian FATHERS will hardly escape the censure of those who will not allow high provocation to be an excuse for an unfair representation of an adversary. I say, they will hardly escape censure, for accustoming themselves to speak of the *Mysteries* as gross impieties and immoralities in their very original §. Clemens Alexandrinus, in a heat of zeal, breaks out. "Let him be accursed, who first infected the world "with these impostures, whether it was Dardanus—or "—&c. These I make no scruple to call wicked "authors of impious fables; the fathers of an exe- "crable superstition, who, by this Institution, sowed

* See note [O] at the end of this Book.

† See Diog. Laert. Proœmium, Segm. 5.

‡ Idem, ibid.

§ See note [P] at the end of this Book.

"in

"in human life the seeds of vice and corruption*." But the wisest and best of the pagan world invariably hold, that the *Mysteries* were instituted pure; and proposed the noblest end, by the worthiest means. And even though the express testimony of these writers, supported by the reason of the thing, should be deemed insufficient, yet the character and quality of their Institutor must put the matter out of all doubt. This Institutor, as will be seen presently, was no other than the Lawgiver, or CIVIL MAGISTRATE himself. Wherever the *Mysteries* found public admittance, it was by his introduction; and as oft as ever they were celebrated, it was under his inspection. Now virtue is as essential to the preservation, and vice to the destruction of that Society, over which he presides, as obedience and disobedience are to his office and authority. So that to conceive him disposed to bring in, and to encourage, immoral practices under the mask of Religion, is the same thing as to suspect the Physician of mixing Poisons with his antidotes.

The truth of the matter was this: the *Fathers* bore a secret grudge to the *Mysteries* for their injurious treatment of Christianity on its first appearance in the world. We are to observe, that ATHEISM, by which was meant a contempt of the Gods, was reckoned, in the *Mysteries*, amongst the greatest crimes. So, in the sixth book of the *Æneis* (of which more hereafter) the hottest seats in Tartarus are allotted to the Atheist, such as Salmoneus, Tityus, and the Titans, &c. Now the Christians, for their contempt of the national Gods,

* Ὄλλοιτο ὖν ὁ τῆσδε ἄρξας ἀπάτης ἀνθρώποις· εἴτε ὁ Δάρδανος — εἴτε — τούτους ἐγώγ' ἂν ἀρχικακὸς φήσαιμι μύθον ἀθέων, καὶ δεισιδαιμονίας ὀλεθρίου πατέρας, σπέρμα κακίας καὶ φθορᾶς ἐγκαταφυτεύσαντας τῷ βίῳ τα μυστήρια. Admonitio ad Gentes, pag. 8. A. B. Edit. Sylburg.

 were,

were, on their first appearance, deemed Atheists by the people; and so branded by the Mystagogue, as we find in Lucian *, and exposed amongst the rest in Tartarus, in their solemn shows and representations. This may be gathered from a remarkable passage in Origen, where Celsus thus addresses his adversary: "But now, as you, good man, believe eternal punish-" ments, even so do the interpreters of these holy "*Mysteries*, the Hierophants and Initiators; you "threaten others with these punishments: THESE, on "the contrary, THREATEN YOU †." This explains a passage in Jerom's catalogue of ecclesiastical writers; and will be explained by it. The Father, speaking of Quadratus, says; "Cumque Hadrianus Athenis exe-" gisset hiemem invisens Eleusinem, & omnibus pene "Græciæ sacris initiatus, dedisset, occasionem iis, qui "Christianos oderunt, absque præcepto Imperatoris "vexare credentes, porrexit ei librum pro religione "nostra." Now what *occasion* was afforded at this juncture to the enemies of Christianity, but only this, That, the Grecian *Mysteries* representing the Faithful in an odious light, the Emperor (who but just then had been initiated into almost all of them) might be reasonably thought estranged and indisposed towards Christianity; and so the easier drawn to countenance, or connive at, any injustice done unto it?

This, without doubt, was what sharpened the Fathers against the *Mysteries*; and they were not over tender

* Καὶ ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ [τῆς τελετῆς ἡμέρᾳ] προρρήσεις ἦν, ὥσπερ Ἀθήνησι, τοιαύτη· εἴ τις ἄθεός, ἢ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ, ἢ Ἐπικούρειος, ἥκει καλάσκοπος τῶν ὀργίων φευγέτω — Pseudomantis, T. II. pag. 244. Edit. Reitzii, 4to. Amstel. 1743.

† Μάλιστα μὲν, ὦ βέλτιστε, ὥσπερ σὺ κολάσεις αἰωνίους νομίζουσι· ὅτω καὶ οἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκείνων ἐξηγηταὶ τελεσταί τε καὶ μυσταγωγοί· ἃς σὺ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπειλεῖς, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ σοί. lib. viii.

in

in loading what they did not approve. On this account they gave easy credit to what had been told to them of the abominations in the *Mysteries*; and the rather, perhaps, on account of the *secrecy* with which they were celebrated. The same *Secrecy* in the Christian Rites, and the same language introduced by the Fathers in speaking of them, as we see below, procured as easy credit to those calumnies of murder and incest charged upon them by the Pagans. Nay, what is still more remarkable, those specific enormities, in which their own *Mysteries* were known to offend, they objected to the Christians. "Alii eos [Christianos] ferunt "ipsius Antistitis ac Sacerdotis colere genitalia *." But here comes in the strange part of the story; that, after this, they should so studiously and formally transfer the terms, phrases, rites, ceremonies, and discipline of these *odious Mysteries* into our holy Religion; and, thereby, very early vitiate and deprave, what a pagan writer † could see, and acknowledge, to be ABSOLUTA & SIMPLEX, as it came out of the hands of its Author. Sure then it was some more than ordinary veneration the People had for these *Mysteries*, that could incline the Fathers of the Church to so fatal a counsel: however, the thing is notorious ‡, and the effects have been severely felt.

We have all along supposed the *Mysteries* an invention of the Lawgiver: and, indeed, we had nothing to do with them, but in that view. Now though, from what hath been said, the intelligent reader will collect, we have not supposed amiss, yet since the pertinency

* Cæcil. apud Minut. in Octav.

† Amm. Marcellinus, lib. xxi. cap. 16. Hist.

‡ See note [Q] at the end of this Book.

of the whole discourse, as here applied, depends upon it, he may perhaps expect us to be a little more particular.

That the *Mysteries* were invented, established, and supported by LAWGIVERS, may be seen,

1. From the place of their original; which was EGYPT. This, Herodotus, Diodorus, and Plutarch, who collect from ancient testimonies, expressly affirm; and in this all Antiquity concurs: the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, particularly, retaining the very *Egyptian* Gods, in whose honour they were celebrated; Ceres and Triptolemus being only two other names for Isis* and Osiris: as we have seen above from Theodoret: and so Tibullus,—

Primus aratra manu sollerti fecit OSIRIS,
Et teneram ferro sollicitavit humum †.

Hence it is, that the UNIVERSAL NATURE, or the *first Cause*, the object of all the *Mysteries*, yet disguised under diverse NAMES, speaking of herself in Apuleius, concludes the enumeration of her various mystic rites, in these words, — "Priscaque doctrina pollentes "ÆGYPTII, CEREMONIIS me prorsus PROPRIIS ‡ "percolentes, appellant VERO NOMINE reginam "ISIDEM §."

But the similitude betwen the Rites practised, and the Doctrines taught in the Grecian and Egyptian *Mysteries*, would be alone sufficient to point up to their original: such as the *secrecy* required of the Initiated;

* Ἶσις δέ ἐστι καλὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν Δημήτης. Herodot. lib. ii, cap. 59. And again cap. 156. Δημήτης δὲ Ἶσις.

† See note [R] at the end of this Book.

‡ See note [S] at the end of this Book.

§ Metam. lib. xi.

which,

which, as we shall see hereafter, peculiarly characterized the Egyptian teaching; such as the doctrines taught of a *metempsychosis*, and a future state of rewards and punishments, which the Greek writers agree to have been first set abroach by the Egyptians *; such as *abstinence* enjoined from domestic fowl, fish, and beans †, the peculiar superstition of the Egyptians; such as the Ritual composed in *hieroglyphics*, an invention of the Egyptians ‡. But it would be endless to reckon up all the particulars in which the Egyptian and Grecian Mysteries agreed: it shall suffice to say, that they were in all things the same §.

Again; nothing but the supposition of this common original to all the Grecian *Mysteries* can clear up and reconcile the disputes which arose amongst the Grecian States and Cities, concerning the original of these rites; every one claiming to be the Prototype to the rest. Thus Thrace pretended that they came first from thence; Crete contested the honour with those barbarians; and

* Timæus the Locrian, in his book Of the Soul of the World, speaking of the necessity of inculcating the doctrine of future punishments, calls them ΤΙΜΩΡΙΑΙ ΞΕΝΑΙ, FOREIGN TORMENTS: by which name both Latin and Greek writers generally mean, *Egyptian*, where the subject is Religion.

† See Porphyrius De Abstin.

‡ Senex commissimus ducit me protinus ad ipsas fores ædis amplissimæ, rituque solenni aspersionis celebrato mysterio, ac matutino peracto sacrificio, de opertis adyti profert quosdam libros, literis ignorabilibus prænotatos; partim FIGURIS CUJUSCEMODI ANIMALIUM, CONCEPTI SERMONIS COMPENDIOSA VERBA SUGGERENTES, partim nodosis, & in modum rotæ tortuosis, capreolatimque condensis apicibus. Apul. Metam. lib. xi.

§ Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ τελεταὶ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ταύτης τῆς θεοῦ [Δήμητρος] τότε καταδείχθησαν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, τά τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς ἀρχαιότητας ὡσαύτως ἔχειν Ἀθηναίους καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. Diod. Sic. lib. i.

Athens claimed it from both. And at that time, when they had forgotten the true original, it was impossible to settle and adjust their differences: for each could prove that he did not borrow from others; and, at the same time, seeing a similitude in the Rites *, would conclude that they had borrowed from him. But the owning EGYPT for their common Parent, clears up all difficulties: by accounting for that general likeness which gave birth to every one's pretensions.

Now, in Egypt, all religious Worship being planned and established by Statesmen, and directed to the ends of civil policy, we must conclude, that the *Mysteries* were originally invented by LEGISLATORS.

2. The Sages who brought them out of Egypt, and propagated them in Asia, in Greece, and Britain, were all Kings or Lawgivers; such as Zoroaster, Inachus, Orpheus †, Melampus, Trophonius, Minos, Cinyras, Erectheus, and the Druids.

3. They were under the superintendence of the State. A Magistrate intitled ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, or King, presided in the *Eleusinian Mysteries.* Lysias informs us, that this King was to offer up the public prayers, according to their country Rites; and to see that nothing impious or immoral crept into the celebration ‡. This title

* —— Καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τρόπον τινὰ κοινοποιεῖσθαι· ταῦτά τε, καὶ τῶν Σαμοθρᾳκων, καὶ τὰ ἐν Λήμνῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πολέων· διὰ τὸ τὴς πρωτοπόλεως λέγεσθαι τὰς αὐτές. Strabo, lib. x. p. 466. D. Edit. Paris. 1620. fol.

† Of whom Aristophanes says, Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετὰς θ' ἡμῖν καθίδρυσε, φόνων τ' ἀπέχεσθαι· "Orpheus taught us the *Mysteries*, "and to abstain from murder," i. e. from a life of rapine and violence, such as men lived in the *state of nature.*

‡ — Καὶ εὔχας εὔξασθαι καλὰ τὰ πάτρια — ὅπως ἂν μηδεὶς, εἰδὼς, μηδὲ ἀσεβὴς περὶ τὰ ἱερά — in Andoc.

given

given to the President of the *Mysteries*, was, doubtless, in memory of the first Founder: to whom were joined four officers, chosen by the people, called ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΤΑΙ or Curators *; the priests were only under-officers to these, and had no share in the direction: for this being the Legislator's favourite institution, he took all possible care for its support; which could not be done more effectually, than by his watching over it himself. On the other hand, his interfering too openly in religious matters would have defeated his end; and the people would soon have come to regard this high solemnity as a mere engine of State; on which account he carefully kept behind the curtain. For though it be now apparent that the *Mysteries* were the invention of the Civil Magistrate, yet even some Ancients, who have mentioned the *Mysteries*, seemed not to be apprized of it; and their ignorance hath occasioned great embroilment in all they say on this subject. The reader may see by the second chapter of Meursius's *Eleusinia*, how much the Ancients were at a loss for the true founder of those *Mysteries*; some giving the institution to Ceres; some to Triptolemus; others to Eumolpus; others to Musæus; and some again to Erectheus. How then shall we disengage ourselves from this labyrinth, into which Meursius hath led us, and in which, his guard of Ancients keep us inclosed? This clue will easily conduct us through it. It appears, from what has been said, that Erectheus, KING of Athens, established the *Mysteries* †; but that the people unluckily confounded the Institutor, with the PRIESTS, Eumolpus and Musæus, who first officiated in the rites; and with Ceres and

* See Meursius's Eleusinia, cap. xv.

† And so says Diodorus Siculus, lib. i. Bibl.

Triptolemus,

Triptolemus, the DEITIES, in whose honour they were celebrated. And these mistakes were natural enough*: the poets would be apt, in the licence of their figurative style, to call the Gods, in whose name the *Mysteries* were performed, the Founders of those *Mysteries*; and the people, seeing only the ministry of the officiated priests (the Legislator keeping out of sight) in good earnest believed those Mystagogues to be the founders. And yet, if it were reasonable to expect from Poets or People, attention to their own fancies and opinions, one would think they might have distinguished better, by the help of that mark, which Erectheus left behind him, to ascertain his title; namely, the erection of the officer called βασιλεὺς, or *King*.

4. But this original is still further seen from the qualities required in the aspirants to the *Mysteries*. According to their original institution, neither *slaves* nor *foreigners* were to be admitted into them†. Now if the *Mysteries* were instituted, primarily for the sake of teaching religious truths, there can be no reason given why every man, with the proper moral qualifications, should not be admitted: but supposing them instituted by

* They were committed where no Mystery was affected, in what concerned the open worship of their Gods. Tacitus, speaking of the Temple of the Paphian Venus, says, "Conditorem "Templi Regem Aërian vetus memoria, quidam ipsius Deæ no-"men id perhibent." Hist. lib. ii.

† — ἦλθε [Ἡρακλῆς] πρὸς Εὔμολπον εἰς Ἐλευσῖνα, βουλόμενος μυηθῆναι· ἦν δὲ ἐκ ἐξὸν ΞΕΝΟΙΣ τότε μυεῖσθαι—Schol. Hom. Il. Θ. It was the same in the Cabiric Mysteries, as we learn from Diodorus Siculus, lib.v. who speaks of the like innovation made there. —δοκεῖ δὲ οὗτος πρῶτος ΞΕΝΟΥΣ μυῆσαι. As to slaves, hear Aristophanes in his Θεσμοφόριαζ—

——— σὺ δ' ἄπιθ' ὦ Θρᾷτ' ἐκποδὼν
ΔΟΥΛΟΙΣ γὰρ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων.

the

the State for civil purposes, a very good one may be assigned; for *slaves* and *foreigners* have there, neither property nor country. When afterwards the Greeks, by frequent confederations against the Persian, the common enemy of their liberties, began to consider themselves as one people and Community, the *Mysteries* were extended to all who spoke the GREEK LANGUAGE. Yet the Antients, not reflecting on the original and end of their institution, were much perplexed for the reasons of an exclusion so apparently capricious. Lucian tells us, in *The life of* his friend *Demonax*, that this great philosopher had the courage one day, to ask the Athenians, why they excluded barbarians from their *Mysteries*, when Eumolpus, a barbarous Thracian, had established them *. But he does not tell us their answer. One of the most judicious of our modern critics was as much at a loss; and therefore thinks the restraint ridiculous, as implying, that the Institutors supposed that speaking the Greek tongue contributed to the advancement of piety †.

5. Another proof of this original may be deduced from what was taught promiscuously to all the Ini-

* Ἐτόλμησε δέ ποτε καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ἐρωτῆσαι δημοσίᾳ, τῆς προρρήσεως ἀκούσας, διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν ἀποκλείουσι τοὺς βαρβάρους· καὶ ταῦτα τὸν τὴν τελετὴν αὐτοῖς καλλιγησαμένου Εὐμόλπου, βαρβάρου καὶ Θρᾳκὸς ὄντος. But the fact, that they were not a *grecian* but a *foreign*, that is, barbarous invention, is proved by their very name, μυστήρια, from the eastern dialect, *mistor*, or *mistur*, res aut locus absconditus.

† Auctor est Libanius in Corinthiorum actione, mystagogos summa diligentia initiandos ante omnia monuisse, ut manus puras animumque sibi servarent purum: καὶ τὴν φωνὴν Ἕλληνας εἶναι; *& ut in voce* sive *sermone Græcos se præstarent:* hoc quidem profecto ridiculum, quasi faceret ad veram pietatem, Græca potius quam alia lingua loqui. Is. Casauboni Exercit. xvi. ad Annales Eccl. Baron.

tiated;

tiated; which was, *the necessity of a virtuous and holy life, to obtain a happy immortality.* Now this, we know, could not come from the sacerdotal warehouse: the priests could afford a better pennyworth of their Elysium, at the easy expence of oblations and sacrifices: for, as our great Philosopher well observes (who, however, was not aware of this extraordinary institution for the support of virtue, and therefore concludes too generally) "The Priests made it not their business "to teach the people virtue: if they were diligent in "their observations and ceremonies, punctual in their "feasts and solemnities, and the tricks of religion, the "holy tribe assured them that the Gods were pleased, "and they looked no further: few went to the schools "of Philosophers, to be instructed in their duty, and "to know what was good and evil in their actions: "the Priests sold the better pennyworths, and there-"fore had all the custom: for lustrations and sacrifices "were much easier than a clean conscience and a "steddy course of virtue; and an expiatory sacrifice, "that atoned for the want of it, much more conve-"nient than a strict and holy life*." Now we may be assured, that an Institution, which taught the necessity of a strict and holy life, could not but be the invention of Lawgivers, to whose schemes moral virtue was so necessary.

6. Another strong presumption of this original is the great use of the *Mysteries* to the State: so amply confessed by the wisest writers of antiquity, and so clearly seen from the nature of the thing itself.

7. But, lastly, we have the testimony of the knowing Plutarch for this original; who, in his treatise *Of*

* Locke's Reasonableness of Christianity.

Isis

Isis and Osiris, expressly tells us, that it was "a most "ancient opinion, delivered down, from LEGISLATORS "and Divines, to Poets and Philosophers, the author "of it entirely unknown, but the belief of it indelibly "established, not only in tradition, and the talk of "the vulgar, but in the MYSTERIES and in the sacred "offices of religion, both amongst Greeks and Bar-"barians, spread all over the face of the globe, That "the Universe was not upheld fortuitously, without "Mind, Reason, or a Governor to preside over its "revolutions*."

It is now submitted to the candid reader, Whether it be not fairly proved, that the MYSTERIES *were invented by the* LEGISLATOR, *to affirm and establish the general doctrine of a Providence, by inculcating the belief of a future state of rewards and punishments.* Indeed, if we may believe a certain Ancient, who appears to have been well versed in these matters, they gained their end, by clearing up all doubts concerning the righteous government of the Gods†.

We have seen in general, how fond and tenacious ancient Paganism was of this extraordinary Rite, as of an Institution supremely useful both to SOCIETY and RELIGION. But this will be seen more fully in

* Διό καὶ παμπάλαιον αὕτη κάτεισιν ἐκ θεολόγων καὶ NOMOΘΕΤΩΝ εἰς τε ποιητὰς καὶ φιλοσόφους δόξα, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀδέσποτον ἔχουσα, τὴν δὲ πίστιν ἰσχυρὰν καὶ δυσεξάλειπτον, ἐκ ἐν λόγοις μόνον, οὐδὲ ἐν φήμαις, ἀλλὰ ἔν τε ΤΕΛΕΤΑΙΣ, ἔν τε θυσίαις, καὶ βαρβάροις καὶ Ἕλλησι πολλαχῆ περιφερομένη, ὡς ὕπ' ἄνων καὶ ἀλόγων καὶ ἀκινδύνων αἰωρεῖται τῷ αὐτομάτῳ τὸ πᾶν.——Edit. Francof. fol. T. II. p. 369. B.

† Ὁ δὲ τοῖς μυστικοῖς ἐγκαθιερῶσαι παραγγέλμασιν ὑπομείνας, καὶ πρὸς τὰς τελετὰς αὐτὰς εὐσεβὴς καθὸ δεισιδαίμων γενόμενος· περὶ οὐδενὸς ἧττι τὴν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἔχει θρησκείαν ἀμφίβολον. Sopater in Divis. Quæst.

what

what I now proceed to lay before the Public; an examination of two celebrated pieces of Antiquity, the famous SIXTH BOOK OF VIRGIL'S ÆNEIS, and the METAMORPHOSIS OF APULEIUS: The first of which will shew us of what use the *Mysteries* were esteemed to SOCIETY; and the second, of what support to RELIGION.

An inquiry into Æneas's adventure to the Shades, will have this farther advantage, the instructing us in the *shows and representations of the* MYSTERIES; a part of their history, which the form of this discourse hath not yet afforded us an opportunity of giving. So that nothing will be now wanting to a perfect knowledge of this most extraordinary and important Institution.

For, the descent of Virgil's Hero into the infernal regions, I presume, was no other than a figurative description of an INITIATION; and particularly, a very exact picture of the SPECTACLES in the ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES; where every thing was done in show and machinery; and where a representation * of the history of Ceres afforded opportunity of bringing in the scenes of heaven, hell, elysium, purgatory, and whatever related to the future state of men and heroes.

But to soften this paradox all we can, it may be proper to enquire into the nature of the *Æneis*.

Homer's two poems had each a plain and entire story, to convey as plain and simple a moral: and in

* — ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Πλεῖυς τὴν Κόρην ἥρπασε· καὶ ἡ Δήμητρα ἀλωμένη κατὰ τὰς ἱερήμους τὸ τέκνον ἐζήτει. καὶ τοῦτον τὸν μύθον εἰς ὕψος ἤγαγε τὸ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι σῦρ. Just. Mart. Orat. ad Græc. prope init. Δηὼ δὲ καὶ Κόρη δρᾶμα ἤδη ἐγενέσθην μυστικόν· καὶ τὴν πλάνην, καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν, καὶ τὸ πένθος αὐταῖν Ἐλευσὶς δεδεγμένη. Clemens Alex. in Protreptico, p. 7. E. Edit. Sylburgh.

this,

this, he is justly esteemed excellent. The Roman poet could make no improvements here: the Greek was complete and perfect; so that the patrons of Virgil, even Scaliger himself, are forced to seek for his superior advantages in his episodes, descriptions, similes, and in the chastity and correctness of his thoughts and diction. In the mean time they have all overlooked the principal advantage he had over his great Exemplar.

Virgil found the epic poem in the first rank of human compositions; but this was too narrow a circuit for his enlarged ambition: he was not content that its subject should be to instruct the world in MORALS; much less did he think of PHYSICS, though he was fond of natural enquiries, and Homer's Allegorizers had opened a back-door to let in the Philosopher with the Poet; but he aspired to make it a SYSTEM OF POLITICS. On this plan he wrote the *Æneis*; which, is, indeed, as complete an institute in verse, by EXAMPLE, as the *Republics* of Plato and Tully were in prose, by PRECEPT. Thus he enlarged the bounds, and added a new province to epic poesy. But though every one saw that AUGUSTUS was shadowed in the person of ÆNEAS, yet it being supposed that those political instructions, which the poet designed for the service of mankind, were solely for the use of his Master, they missed of the true nature of the poem. And in this ignorance, the succeeding epic writers, following a work whose genius they did not understand, wrote worse than if they had only taken Homer, and his simpler plan, for their direction. A great modern Poet, and best judge of their merit, assures us of this fact; and what has been said will help us to explain the reason of it; "The other epic poets (says this

"admirable

" admirable writer) have used the same practice [that " of Virgil, of running two fables into one] but gene- " rally carry it so far, as to superinduce a multiplicity " of fables, destroy the unity of action, and lose their " readers in an unreasonable length of time *."

Such was the revolution Virgil brought about in this noblest region of poesy; an improvement so great, that the truest poet had need of all the assistance the sublimest genius could lend him: nothing less than the joint aid of the Iliad and Odysses being able to furnish out the execution of his great idea: for a *system of Politics* delivered in the example of a great Prince, must shew him in every public adventure of life. Hence Æneas was, of necessity, to be found voyaging, with Ulysses, and fighting, with Achilles.

But if the improved nature of his subject compelled him to depart from that simplicity in the fable, which Aristotle, and his best interpreter, Bossu, find so divine in Homer †; he gained considerable advantages by it in other circumstances of the composition: for now, those ornaments and decorations, for whose insertion the critics could give no other reason than to raise the *dignity* of the Poem, become *essential* to the Subject. Thus the choice of Princes and Heroes for his personages, which were, before, only used to grace the scene, now constitute the nature of the action ‡: and

* Preface to the Iliad of Homer.

† Nous trouverons point, dans la fable de l'Eneide, cette simplicité qu'Aristote a trouvée si divine dans Homére. Traité du poeme epique, lib. i. cap. xi.

‡ — " Le retour (says Bossu) d'un homme en sa maison, & la " querelle de deux autres, n'ayant rien de grand en soi, deviennent " des actions illustres & importantes, lorsque dans le choix des " noms, le poete dit que c'est l'Ulysse qui retourne en Ithaque, & " que

and the machinery of the Gods, and their intervention on every occasion, which was to create the MARVELLOUS, becomes, in this improvement, an indispensable part of the poem. A *divine interposition* is in the very spirit of ancient legislation; where, we see, the principal care of the Lawgiver was to possess the people with the full belief of an overruling Providence. This is the true reason of so much machinery in the Æneis: for which, modern critics impeach the author's judgment, who, in a poem written in the refined and enlightened age of Rome *, followed the *marvellous* of Homer so closely. An excellent writer, speaking of Virgil in this view, says, "If there be any instance "in the Æneid liable to exception upon this account, "it is in the beginning of the third book, where Æneas "is represented as tearing up the myrtle that dropped "blood. This circumstance seems to have the *mar-* "*vellous* without the probable, because it is represent- "ed as proceeding from natural causes without the "interposition of any God, or rather, supernatural "power capable of producing it †." But surely this instance was ill chosen. The poet makes Æneas say, on this occasion,

Nymphas

"que c'est Achille & Agamemnon qui querellent."—He goes on, "Mais il y a des actions qui d'elles mêmes sont très importantes, "comme *l'establissement, ou la ruine d'un etat, ou d'une religion.* "Telle est donc l'action de l'Eneide." lib. ii. cap. 19. He saw here a remarkable difference in the subjects; it is strange this should not have led him to see that the *Æneis* is of a different species.

* Ce qui est beau dans Homére pourroit avoir été mal reçû dans les ouvrages d'un poete du tems d'Auguste. Idem, lib. iii. cap. 8. *De l'admirable.*

† Mr. Addison's Works, vol. iii. p. 316. quarto edit. 1721.

- - - - Nymphas venerabar agrestes,
Gradivumque patrem, Geticis qui præsidet arvis,
Rite secundarent visus OMENque levarent *.

Now *omens* were of two kinds †, the natural and supernatural. This in question, was of the latter sort, produced by the intervention of the Gods, as appears by his calling this adventure, MONSTRA DEUM: it was of the nature of those *portentous showers of blood* so frequently occurring in the Roman history. And the poet was certainly within the bounds of the probable, while he told no more than what their gravest writers did not scruple to record in their annals.

But this was not done merely to raise admiration. He is here (as we observe) in his legislative character; and writes to possess the people of the interposition of the Gods, in OMENS and PRODIGIES. This was the method of the old Lawgivers. So Plutarch, as quoted above, tells us, " that with divinations and OMENS, " Lycurgus sanctified the Lacedemonians, Numa the " Romans, Ion the Athenians, and Deucalion all the " Greeks in general; and by hopes and fears kept up " in them the awe and reverence of Religion." The scene of this adventure is laid, with the utmost propriety, on the uncivilized inhospitable shores of Thrace, to inspire horror for *barbarous manners*, and an appetite for social life. On this account it is that our poet here deserts the Mythologists, and makes the age of CIVIL POLICY, (the time when men were first brought out of a state of nature) *the golden age*, and SATURN to govern in it. Thus Evander says,

* Lib. iii.

† See note [T] at the end of this Book.

Hæc

Hæc nemora indigenæ fauni nymphæque tenebant - - -
Queis neque mos, neque cultus erat; neque jungere tauros,
Aut componere opes norant, aut parcere parto:
Sed rami atque asper victu venatus alebat.
Primus ab ætherio venit SATURNUS Olympo—
Is genus indocile, ac dispersum montibus altis,
COMPOSUIT, LEGESQUE DEDIT *.

Whereas Ovid, who speaks the sense of the Mythologists, makes the *golden age* to be *the state of nature*, and SATURN to govern there, before the erection of *civil policy*.

Aurea prima sata est ætas, quæ, vindice nullo,
Sponte sua, SINE LEGE fidem rectumque colebat.
Pœna metusque aberant: NEC VERBA MINACIA FIXO
Ære legebantur: nec supplex turba timebant
JUDICIS ora sui. - - -
Ipsa quoque immunis rastroque intacta, nec ullis
Saucia vomeribus, per se dabat omnia tellus:
Contentique cibis nullo cogente creatis,
Arbuteos fœtus, montanaque fragra legebant,
Cornaque & in duris hærentia mora rubetis,
Et quæ deciderant patula Jovis arbore glandes.
Ver erat æternum - - -
Postquam SATURNO tenebrosa in Tartara misso —
Tum primum subiere domos - - -
Semina tum primum longis Cerealia sulcis
Obruta sunt, pressique jugo gemuere juvenci †.

For it served the grave purpose of the philosophic Poet to decry the state of nature; and it suited the

* Lib. viii. † Metam. lib. i.

 fanciful

fanciful paintings of the mythologic Poet to recommend it.

But every thing in this poem points to great and public ends. The turning *the ships into sea-deities*, in the ninth book, has the appearance of something infinitely more extravagant, than the *myrtle dropping blood*, and has been more generally and severely censured; and indeed, if defended, it must be on other principles. The philosophic commentators of Homer's poem, had brought the fantastic refinement of Allegory into great vogue. We may estimate the capacity of Virgil's judgment in not catching at so alluring a bait, by observing that some of the greatest of the modern epic poets, who approached nearest to Virgil in genius, have been betrayed by it. Yet here and there, our poet, to convey a political precept, has employed an ingenious allegory in passing. And the adventure in question is, I think, of this number. By the transformation of the ships into sea-deities, he would insinuate, I suppose, the great advantages of cultivating a naval power; such as extended commerce, and the dominion of the Ocean; which, in poetical language, is becoming *deities of the sea.*

Mortalem eripiam formam, magnique jubebo.
Æquoris esse Deas - - -

He explains the allegory more clearly in the following book, where he makes these transformed sea-nymphs accompany Æneas, and his fleet of auxiliaries, through the Tyrrhene sea.

Atque illi medio in spatio chorus, ecce, suarum
Occurrit comitum: nymphæ, quas alma Cybele
Numen habere maris, nymphasque e navibus esse
Jusserat - - -
Agnoscunt longe regem lustrantque choreïs.

This

This Ministerial hint was the more important and seasonable, as all Octavius's traverses, in his way to Empire, were from his want of a sufficient naval Power; first in his War with Brutus and Cassius, and afterwards with Sextus, the son of Pompey the Great. Nor was it, at this time, less flattering to Augustus; to whom the Alexandrians erected a magnificent Temple, Porticoes, and sacred Groves, where he was worshipped under the title of CÆSAR THE PROTECTOR AND PATRON OF SAILORS. So he became a *Sea-God* and at the head of these *Goddesses*. For as one of his Flatterers said,

" Præsenti tibi MATUROS largimur honores:
" Jurandasque TUUM PER NOMEN ponimus aras."

As the not taking the true scope of the *Æneis*, hath occasioned mistakes, to Virgil's disadvantage, concerning the *plan and conduct* of the poem; so hath it likewise, concerning the *Characters*. The PIETY of Æneas, and his high veneration for the Gods, so much offends a celebrated French writer *, that he says, *the hero was fitter to found a religion† than a monarchy*. He did not know, that the image of a perfect Lawgiver is held out to us in Æneas: and had he known that, he had perhaps been ignorant, that it was the office of such a one to found *religions* and colleges of priests ‡, as well as states and corporations. And Virgil tells us this was the office of his hero:

* Mons. de St. Evremond. † i. e. a community of monks.

‡ - - - Ἔνθα Προμηθεὺς,
Ἰαπελιονίδης ἀγαθὸν τέκε Δευκαλέωνα,
Ὃς πρῶτος ΠΟΙΗΣΕ ΠΟΛΕΙΣ καὶ ΕΔΕΙΜΑΤΟ ΝΗΟΥΣ ΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΙΣ, πρῶτος δὲ καὶ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕΝ.

- - - Dum conderet URBEM,
Inferretque DEOS Latio - - -

On the other hand Turnus, whose manners are contrasted with those of our Hero, is, on his very first appearance, marked out by his irreverence to the Priestess of Juno. But the humanity of Æneas offends this critic as well as his piety; he calls him a mere St. Swithin, always raining. The beauty of that circumstance escaped him. It was proper to represent a perfect Lawgiver as quickly touched with all the affections of humanity: and the example was the rather to be inforced, because vulgar Politicians are but too generally seen divested of these common notices; and the habit of vulgar heroism is apt to induce passions very opposite to them. Thus Virgil having painted Turnus in all the colours of Achilles, and Æneas in those of Hector (for the subject of the *Iliad* being the destruction of a vicious and corrupt Community, the fittest instrument was a brutal warrior, *acer*, *iracundus*, such as Achilles; and the subject of the *Æneid* being the erection of a great and virtuous Empire, the fittest instrument was a pious patriot, like Hector,) Turnus, I say, was to be characterized as one delighting in blood and slaughter.

Sævit amor ferri, & SCELERATA insania belli,
Ira super * - - -

And, to make this passion the more detestable, the Poet tells us it was inspired into him by a Fury. But when he represents Æneas as accepting the favourable signs from Heaven, which pushed him on to war, he draws him, agreeable to such a character, compassion-

* Lib. vii. v. 461.

ating

ating the miseries which his very enemies, by their breach of faith, were to suffer in it.

Heu, quantæ miseris cædes Laurentibus instant!
Quas pœnas mihi, Turne, dabis! quam multa per undas
Scuta virûm, galeasque, & fortia corpora volves,
Tibri pater! poscant acies, & fœdera rumpant*.

But the circumstances of his Mistress, as well as those of his Rival, are artfully contrived to set off His PIETY. On excusing his departure to the enraged Queen of Carthage, as forced by the command of the Gods, she is made to answer him with this Epicurean scoff,

Scilicet is superis LABOR est, ea *cura* QUIETOS
SOLLICITAT† - - -

very properly put into the mouth of a Woman immersed in voluptuous pleasures. Yet the Poet takes care to tell us, that her impiety, like Turnus's delight in blood and slaughter, was inspired by the Furies.

Heu! Furiis incensa feror - - -

But there is a further beauty in this circumstance of the Episode. These two Lovers are made the Founders of the two Hostile States of Rome and Carthage. So, this was to insinuate (in support of the author's main purpose) That it was want of religion which occasioned the *Punica Fides*; and the pious culture of it, which created the

Alta Moenia Romæ.

Again, the Hero was to be drawn no less master of himself, under the charms of the softer passions, than

* Lib. viii. v. 537. † Lib. iv.

under the violence of the rougher and more horrid. M. Voltaire says,

Virgile orne mieux la raison,
A plus d'art, autant d' harmonie ;
Mais il s' epuise avec Didon,
Et rate à la fin Lavinie.

But this ingenious man did not consider, that the Episode of Dido and Æneas, was not given to ornament his poem with an amusing tale of a love adventure, but to expose the public mischiefs which arise from Rulers indulging themselves in this voluptuous weakness, while they become

Regnorum immemores, turpique cupidine captos.

The Poet therefore had defeated his own design, if when he had recovered his Hero from this weakness, and made him say of his destined Empire in Italy,

— hic Amor, hæc Patria est - - -

if when he had perfected his Character, and brought him to the end of his labours, he had still drawn him struggling with this impotent and unruly passion.

Nor is the view, in which we place this poem, less serviceable to the vindication of the Poet's other characters. The learned author of the *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer*, will allow me to differ from him, in thinking that those *uniform manners* in the Æneis, which he speaks of, was the effect of design, not, as he would have it, of custom and habit: "Virgil, says he, had seen much of the splendor of "a court, the magnificence of a palace, and the "grandeur of a royal equipage: accordingly his repre-"sentations of that part of life, are more august and "stately than Homer's. He has a greater regard to "decency,

" decency, and those polished manners, that render " men so much of a piece, and make them all resemble " one another in their conduct and behaviour*." For the Æneis being a system of Politics, what this writer calls *the eternity of a government, the form of a magistrature, and plan of dominion,* must needs be *familiar with the Roman poet*; and nothing could be more to his purpose, than a representation of *polished manners*; it being the Legislator's office to tame and break men to humanity; and to make them disguise, at least, if they cannot be brought to lay aside, their savage habits.

But this key to the Æneis not only clears up many passages obnoxious to the critics, but adds infinite beauty to a great number of incidents throughout the whole poem; of which take the following instances, the one, in *Religion*, and the other, in *civil Policy.*

1. Æneas, in the eighth book, goes to the Court of Evander, in order to engage him in a confederacy against the common enemy. He finds the king and his people busied in the celebration of an annual sacrifice. The purpose of the voyage is dispatched in a few lines, and the whole episode is taken up in a matter altogether foreign to it, that is to say, the sacrifice, the feast, and a long history of Hercules's adventure with Cacus. But it is done with great art and propriety; and in order to introduce, into this political poem, that famous institute of Cicero, (in his book Of Laws) designed to moderate the excess of labouring superstition, the *ignotæ ceremoniæ*, as he calls them, which at that time so much abounded in Rome—

* Page 325.

Divos

" Divos & eos, qui cœlestes semper habiti, colunto,
" & ollos, QUOS ENDO CŒLO MERITA VOCAVERINT,
" HERCULEM, Liberum, Æsculapium, Castorem,
" Pollucem, Quirinum"—Thus copied by Virgil, in the beginning of Evander's speech to Æneas,

Rex Evandrus ait: Non hæc solemnia nobis,
Has ex more dapes, hanc tanti numinis aram
VANA SUPERSTITIO VETERUMQUE IGNARA DEORUM
Imposuit. *Sævis*, hospes Trojane, *periclis*
Servati facimus, MERITOSQUE novamus HONORES—

A lesson of great importance to the pagan Lawgiver. This *Vana superstitio ignara veterum deorum* was, as we have shewn, a matter he took much care to rectify in the *Mysteries*; not by destroying that species of idolatry, the worship of dead men, which was indeed his own invention, but by shewing *why* they paid that worship; namely, for benefits done to the whole race of mankind, by those deified Heroes.

Quare agite, o juvenes! *tantarum in munere laudum*, &c.

The conclusion of Evander's speech,

COMMUNEMQUE VOCATE DEUM, & date vina volentes,

alludes to that other institute of Cicero, in the same book Of Laws. " SEPARATIM nemo habessit Deos:
" neve NOVOS, neve advenas, nisi publice adscitos,
" PRIVATIM colunto." Of which he gives the reason in his comment, " suosque Deos, aut Novos aut
" Alienigenas coli, confusionem habet religionum, &
" ignotas ceremonias."

Nor should we omit to observe a further beauty in this episode; and, in imitation, still, of Cicero; who, in his book Of Laws, hath taken the best of the Roman Institutes, for the foundation of his system: For the worship of HERCULES, as introduced by Evander, and administered by the POTITII on the altar called the ARA MAXIMA, was, as Dion. Hal. and Livy tell us, the oldest establishment in Rome; and continued for many ages in high veneration. To this the following lines allude,

Hanc ARAM luco statuit, quæ MAXIMA semper, &c.
—Jamque sacerdotes, primusque POTITIUS, ibant.

But Virgil was so learned in all that concerned the Roman ritual, that it was a common saying, (as we collect from Macrobius) *Virgilius noster Pontifex maximus videtur:* And that writer not apprehending the reason of so exact an attention to sacred things, being ignorant of the nature of the poem, says, MIRANDUM est hujus poetæ et circa nostra et circa externa sacra doctrinam *.

2. In the *ninth* book we have the fine episode of Nisus and Euryalus; which presents us with many new graces, when considered (which it ought to be) as a representation of one of the most famous and singular of the Grecian Institutions. CRETE, that ancient and celebrated School of legislation, had a civil custom, which the Spartans first, and afterwards all the principal cities of *Greece* †, borrowed from them, for every man of distinguished valour or wisdom to adopt a favourite youth, for whose education he was answerable,

* Saturn. l. iii. c. 6.

† See note [U] at the end of this Book.

and

and whose manners he had the care of forming. Hence Nisus is said to be

- - - ACERRIMUS ARMIS,
Hyrtacides;

And Euryalus,

- - COMES Euryalus, quo PULCHRIOR alter
Non fuit Æneadum, Trojana neque induit arma;
Ora PUER prima signans INTONSA JUVENTA.

The LOVERS (as they were called) and their YOUTHS always served and fought together;——so Virgil of these:

His amor unus erat, pariterque in bella ruebant,
Tum quoque communi portam statione tenebant.

The Lovers used to make presents to their favourite youths.—So Nisus tells his friend:

Si, TIBI, quæ POSCO promittunt (nam *mihi* facti
Fama sat est) &c.

The states of Greece, where this Institution prevailed, reaped so many advantages from it, that they gave it the greatest encouragement by their laws: so that Cicero, in his book *Of a republic*, observed, "oppro-" brio fuisse adolescentibus si amatores non haberent?" Virgil has been equally intent to recommend it by all the charms of poetry and eloquence. The amiable character, the affecting circumstance, the tenderness of distress, are all inimitably painted.

The youth so educated, were found to be the best bulwark of their country, and most formidable to the enemies of civil liberty. On which account, the Tyrants, wherever they prevailed, used all their arts to suppress

suppress an Institution so opposite to private interest and ambition. The annals of ancient Greece afford many examples of the bravery of these Bands, who cheerfully attempted the most hazardous adventures *. So that Virgil did but follow the custom of the best policied States (which it was much for his honour to do) when he put these two friends on one of the most daring actions of the whole war; as old Aletes understood it:

> Dî patrii, quorum semper sub numine Troja est,
> Non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis,
> Cum tales animos juvenum, & tam certa tulistis
> Pectora.

Plutarch, speaking of the Thebans, in the *Life of Pelopidas*, says, that "Gorgias first enrolled the SACRED BAND, consisting of three hundred chosen "men; and that this corps was said to be composed "of LOVERS and their FRIENDS. It is reported, says "he, that it continued unconquered till the battle of "Chæronea; and when, after that action, Philip was "surveying the dead, and came to the very spot where "these three hundred fell, who had charged in close "order so fatally on the Macedonian lances, and ob-"served how they lay heaped upon one another, he "was amazed, and being told, that this was the band "of *Lovers* and their *Friends*, he burst into tears, and "said, *Accursed be they who can suspect that these "men either did or suffered any thing dishonest.* But "certainly (continues my author) this institution of "Lovers did not arise in Thebes, as the poets feigned, "from the PASSION of Laius, but from the WISDOM

* See note [X] at the end of this Book.

"of

" of Legislators *." Such was the Friendship our poet would here represent, where he says,

Nisus AMORE PIO pueri—

and where he makes Ascanius call Euryalus,

VENERANDE puer—

The one dies in defence of the other; revenges his death; and then falls with him, like the Lovers in the SACRED BAND:

- - - - moriens animam abstulit hosti.
Tum super exanimem sese projecit AMICUM
Confossus, placidaque ibi demum morte quievit.

And here let it be observed, that, as this episode is given for a picture of this Institution in it's purity; so, in the Enemies' quarter, he hath given another drawing of it, in it's degeneracy and corruption: for the SACRED BAND, like the MYSTERIES, underwent the common fate of time and malice.

— Tu quoque flaventem prima lanugine malas
Dum sequeris Clytium infelix, nova gaudia, Cydon,

* Τὸν δ' ἱερὸν λόχον, ὥς φασιν, συνεπάξαι Γοργίδας πρῶτος, ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ἐπιλέκτων τριακοσίων,—ἔνιοι δὲ φασιν ἐξ ἐρασῶν καὶ ἐρωμένων γενέσθαι τὸ σύστημα τοῦτο.——λέγεται δὲ διαμεῖναι μέχρι τῆς ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχης ἀήττητον· ὡς δὲ μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐφορῶν τοὺς νεκροὺς ὁ Φίλιππος. ἔστη καὶ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον, ἐν ᾧ συνεπέπτωκεσαν κεῖσθαι τοὺς τριακοσίους ἐναντίους ἀπηνθρακότας ταῖς σαρίσσαις ἅπαντας ἐν τοῖς στενοῖς ὅπλοις, καὶ μετ' ἀλλήλων ἀναμιγνυμένους, θαυμάσαντα, καὶ συνθόμενον ὡς ὁ τῶν ἐρασῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρωμένων οὗτος εἴη λόχος δακρύσαι, καὶ εἰπεῖν, Ἀπόλοιντο κακῶς οἱ τοῦτο τι ποιεῖν ἢ πάσχειν αἰσχρὸν ὑπονοοῦντες. Ὅλως δὲ τῆς περὶ τοὺς ἐρασὰς συνηθείας, ἐχ ὥσπερ οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσι, Θηβαίοις τὸ λαῖτε πάθος ἀρχὴν παρέσχεν, ἀλλ' οἱ NOMOΘETAI. Tom. I. p. 287. B. et E. Francof. Edit. fol. 1599. (Vol. II. p. 218, 219. ed. Brian.)

Dardania

Dardania stratus dextra securus amorum
Qui juvenum tibi semper erant, miserande jaceres*.

The poet hath observed the same conduct, as we shall see hereafter, with regard to the *pure* and the *corrupt* MYSTERIES.

Before I leave these previous circumstances, permit me only to take notice, that this was the *second species* of the EPIC POEM; our own countryman, Milton, having produced the *third:* for just as Virgil rivaled Homer, so Milton was the emulator of both. He found Homer possessed of the province of MORALITY; Virgil of POLITICS: and nothing left for him, but that of RELIGION. This he seized, as ambitious to share with them in the Government of the poetic world; and by means of the superior dignity of his subject, hath gotten to the head of that Triumvirate which took so many ages in forming. These are the *three species* of the Epic poem; for its largest sphere is HUMAN ACTION; which can be only considered in a *moral*, a *political*, or *religious* view: and these the three great MAKERS; for each of their Poems was struck out at a heat, and came to perfection from its first essay. Here then the grand Scene was closed: and all further improvements of the Epic at an end.

It being now understood, that the Æneis is in the style of ancient legislation, it would be hard to think that so great a master in his art, should overlook a DOCTRINE, which, we have shewn, was the foundation and support of ancient Politics; namely a *future state of rewards and punishments.* Accordingly he hath

* L. x. ver. 324.

given

given us a complete system of it, in imitation of his models, which were Plato's *vision of Erus*, and Tully's *dream of Scipio*. Again, as the Lawgiver took care to support this *Doctrine* by a very extraordinary Institution, and to commemorate it by a RITE, which had all the allurement of spectacle; and afforded matter for the utmost embellishments of poetry, we cannot but confess a description of such a Scene would add largely to the grace and elegance of his work; and must conclude he would be invited to attempt it. Accordingly, we say, he hath done this likewise, in the allegorical descent of Æneas into Hell; which is no other than an enigmatical representation of his INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES.

Virgil was to represent an Heroic Lawgiver in the person of Æneas; now, INITIATION into the *Mysteries* was what sanctified his Character and ennobled his Function. Hence we find all the ancient Heroes and Lawgivers were, in fact, initiated *. And it was no wonder the Legislator should endeavour by his example to give credit to an institution of his own creating.

Another reason for the Hero's initiation was the important instructions the founders of Empire received in matters that concerned their office †, as we may see in the second section of the third book.

* Δεῖξεν Τριπτολέμῳ τε Διόκλεί τε Πληξίππῳ
Εὐμόλπῳ τε βίη, κελέῳ θ' ἡγήτορι λαῶν,
Δρησμοσύνην ἱερῶν, καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὀργία πᾶσιν.
Homeri Fragm. Hymn. in Cer. apud Paus. Corinth.

† — γίνεσθαι δὲ φασι καὶ εὐσεβεστέρους καὶ δικαιοτέρους, καὶ κατὰ πάντα βελτίονας ἑαυτῶν τοὺς τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνήσαντας· διὸ καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἡρώων τε καὶ ἡμιθέων τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τετιμῆσθαι μεταλαβεῖν τῆς τελετῆς· καὶ γὰρ Ἰασίωνα καὶ Διοσκόρους, ἔτι δ' Ἡρακλέα καὶ Ὀρφέα μυηθέντας ἐπιτυχεῖν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς στρατείαις, διὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν τούτων ἐπιφάνειαν. Diod. p. 224.

A third

A third reason for his initiation, was their custom of seeking support and inspiration from the God who presided in the *Mysteries**.

A fourth reason for his initiation, was the circumstance in which the poet has placed him, unsettled in his affairs, and anxious about his future fortune. Now, amongst the uses of initiation, the advice and direction of the ORACLE was not the least: and an oracular bureau was so necessary an appendix to some of the *Mysteries*, as particularly the *Samothracian*, that Plutarch, speaking of Lysander's initiation there, expresses it by a word that signifies *consulting the oracle*, Ἐν δὲ Σαμοθράκῃ χρησηριαζόμενῳ, &c. On this account, Jason, Orpheus, Hercules, Castor, and (as Macrobius says †) Tarquinius Priscus, were every one of them initiated into the *Mysteries*.

All this the poet seems clearly to have intimated in the speech of Anchises to his son:

> Lectos juvenes fortissima corda,
> Defer in Italiam.—Gens dura atque aspera cultu
> *Debellanda tibi Latio est. Ditis tamen ante*
> INFERNAS *accede* DOMOS—
> Tum genus omne tuum, &, *quæ dentur mœnia,*
> DISCES‡.

A fifth reason was the conforming to the old popular tradition, which said, that several other Heroes of

* Lib. ii. cap. 4.

† The rhetor Sopater, in his Διαιρέσεις ζητημάτων, makes Pericles say, Πιστεύω ταῖς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι θεαῖς, τετόν μοι ἐκθεθηκέναι τὸν νῶν, καὶ τὸ στρατήγημα τετο ἐξ ἀναπλόῳ δεῖναι τῶν μυστικῶν.

‡ Æn. v. ver. 729, & seq.

the Trojan times, such as Agamemnon and Ulysses, had been initiated*.

A sixth and principal was, that AUGUSTUS, who was shadowed in the person of Æneas, had been initiated into the ELEUSINIAN *Mysteries* †.

While the *Mysteries* were confined to Egypt, their native country, and while the Grecian Lawgivers went thither to be initiated, as a kind of designation to their office, the ceremony would be naturally described, in terms highly allegorical. This was, in part, owing to the genius of the Egyptian manners; in part, to the humour of Travellers; but most of all, to the policy of Lawgivers; who, returning home, to civilize a barbarous people, by Laws and Arts, found it useful and necessary (in order to support their own characters, and to establish the fundamental principle of a FUTURE STATE) to represent *that* initiation, in which, was seen the condition of departed mortals in machinery, as AN ACTUAL DESCENT INTO HELL. This way of speaking was used by Orpheus, Bacchus, and others; and continued even after the *Mysteries* were introduced into Greece, as appears by the fables of Hercules, Castor, Pollux, and Theseus's *descent into hell.* But the allegory was generally so circumstanced, as to discover the truth concealed under it. So Orpheus is said to get to hell by the power of his harp:

Threïcia fretus cithara, fidibusque canoris:

* Ἀγαμέμνονά φασι μεμυημένον, ἐν ταραχῇ ὄντα πολλῇ κατὰ Τροίαν, δι' ἀκαταστασίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, παῦσαι τὴν στάσιν, πορφυρίδα ἔχοντα — Ὀδυσσέα φασὶ μεμυημένον ἐν Σαμοθρᾷκη χρήσασθαι τῷ κρηδέμνῳ ἀντὶ ταινίας. Scholia Apollon. Rhod. Arg. lib. i. ver. 916.

- - - - Ὄφρα δαέντες
Ἀῤῥήκτους ἀγανῇσι τελεσφορίῃσι θεμίστας - - -

† Suet. Oct. c. xciii. See note [Y] at the end of this Book.

that

that is, in quality of Lawgiver; the harp being the known symbol of his laws, by which he humanized a rude and barbarous people. So again, in the lives of Hercules and Bacchus, we have the true history, and the fable founded on it, blended and recorded together. For we are told, that they were in fact initiated into the *Eleusinian Mysteries*; and that it was just before their descent into Hell, as an aid and security in that desperate undertaking*. Which, in plain speech, was no more, than that they were initiated into the *lesser Mysteries* before they were admitted into the *greater*. The same may be said of what is told us of Theseus's adventure. Near Eleusis there was a Well, called Callichorus; and, adjoining to that, a *stone*, on which, as the tradition went, Ceres sat down, sad and weary, on her coming to Eleusis. Hence the stone was named Agelastus, the *melancholy stone*†. On which account it was deemed unlawful for the Initiated to sit thereon. " For Ceres (says Clemens) wandering " about in search of her daughter Proserpine, when " she came to Eleusis, grew weary, and sat down me- " lancholy on the side of a well. So that, to this very " day, it is unlawful for the Initiated to sit down there, " lest they, who are now become perfect, should seem " to imitate her in her desolate condition‡." Now

* — Καὶ τὸς περὶ Ἡρακλέα τε καὶ Διόνυσον, καλιόνλας εἰς ἅδθ, πρότερον λόγῳ ἐνθάδε μυηθῆναι, καὶ τὸ θάρσῳ τῆς ἐκεῖσε πορείας παρὰ τῆς Ἐλευσινίας ἐναύσασθαι. Auctor Axiochi.

† Ἀγέλαστον πέτρα. So Ovid:

Hic primum sedit gelido mœstissima saxo;
Illud Cecropidæ nunc quoque *triste* vocant.

‡ "Αλωμένη γὰρ ἡ Δηὼ καλὰ ζήτησιν τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς κόρης, περὶ τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα, — αὐτοκάμνει, καὶ φρέατι ἐπικαθίζει λυπουμένη. Τοῦτο τοῖς μεμυημένοις ἀπαγορεύειαι εἰσέτι νῦν, ἵνα μὴ δοκοῖεν οἱ τελεσμένον μιμεῖσθαι τὴν ἐθυρομένην. Clemens Protrept. pag. 10. A. Edit. Sylburg.

let us see what they tell us concerning Theseus's descent into hell. "There is also a stone (says the scholiast "on Aristophanes) called by the Athenians, Agelastus; "on which, they say, Theseus sat when he was medi- "tating his descent into hell. Hence the stone had "its name. Or, perhaps, because Ceres sat there, "weeping, when she sought Proserpine*." All this seems plainly to intimate, that the *descent* of Theseus was his *entrance* into the *Eleusinian Mysteries*. Which entrance (as we shall see hereafter) was a fraudulent intrusion.

Both Euripides and Aristophanes seem to confirm our interpretation of *these descents into hell*. Euripides, in his Hercules furens, brings the hero, just come from hell, to succour his family, and destroy the tyrant Lycus. Juno, in revenge, persecutes him with the Furies; and he, in his transport, kills his wife and children, whom he mistakes for his enemies. When he comes to himself, he is comforted by his friend Theseus; who would excuse his excesses by the criminal examples of the Gods: a consideration which, as I have observed above, greatly encouraged the people in their irregularities; and was therefore obviated in the Mysteries, by the detection of the vulgar errors of polytheism. Now Euripides seems plainly enough to have told us what he thought of the fabulous descents into hell, by making Hercules reply, like one just come from the celebration of the Mysteries, and entrusted with the ἀπόῤῥητα. "The examples (says he) which you bring "of the Gods, are nothing to the purpose. I cannot

* Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἀγέλαστος πέτρα καλουμένη παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ὅπου καθίσαι φασὶ Θησέα μέλλοντα καταβαίνειν εἰς ᾅδου· ὅθεν καὶ τὸνομα τῇ πέτρᾳ· ἢ ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐκάθισεν ἡ Δημήτηρ κλαίουσα, ὅταν ἐζήτει τὴν κόρην. Schol. Equit. Aristoph. l. 782.

"think

" think them guilty of the crimes imputed to them. I " cannot apprehend, how one God can be the sovereign " of another God.—A God, who is truly so, stands in " need of no one. Reject we then these idle fables, " which the poets teach concerning them." A *secret*, which we must suppose, Theseus (whose entrance into the *Mysteries* was only a fraudulent intrusion) had not yet learnt.

The comic poet, in his *Frogs*, tells us as plainly what he too understood to be the ancient heroes' descent into hell, by the equipage, which he gives to Bacchus, when he brings him in, enquiring the way of Hercules. It was the custom at the celebration of the *Eleusinian* mysteries, as we are told by the scholiast on the place, to have what was wanted in those rites, carried upon asses. Hence the proverb, *Asinus portat mysteria:* accordingly the poet introduces Bacchus, followed by his buffoon servant Xanthius, bearing a bundle in like manner, and riding on an ass. And, lest the meaning of this should be mistaken, Xanthius, on Hercules's telling Bacchus, that the inhabitants of Elysium were the Initiated, puts in, and says, " And " I am *the ass carrying Mysteries.*" This was so broad a hint, that it seems to have awakened the old dreaming scholiast; who, when he comes to that place, where the Chorus of the Initiated appear, tells us, we are not to understand this scene as really lying in the ELYSIAN FIELDS, but in the ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES*.

Here then, as was the case in many other of the ancient fables, the pomp of expression betrayed willing

* ἰστέον δὲ, ὅτι εἰ μὴ διὰ τὰς ἐν ᾅδου μύστας φαίνεσθαι λέγειν ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ διὰ τὰς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, ἐνταῦθα μὴ ὑφίσαλο ἡ σκηνὴ τὸ δράματος. in ver. 357.

posterity into the *marvellous*. But why need we wonder at this in the genius of more ancient times, which delighted to tell the commonest things in a highly figurative manner, when a writer of so late an age as Apuleius, either in imitation of Antiquity, or perhaps in compliance to the received phraseology of the *Mysteries*, describes his *initiation* in the same manner, "Accessi confinium mortis; & calcato Proserpinæ "limine, per omnia vectus elementa remeavi: nocte "media vidi solem candido coruscantem lumine, Deos "inferos & deos superos. Accessi coram, & adoravi "de proximo*." Æneas could not have described his night's journey to his companions, after he had been let out of the ivory gate, in properer terms, had it been indeed to be understood of a journey into Hell.

Thus, we see, Virgil was obliged to have his Hero initiated; and he actually had the authority of Antiquity to call this initiation *A Descent into Hell*, Ἡ ΕΙΣ ΑΔΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΒΑΣΙΣ. Hence some of the pretended Orphic odes, sung at the celebration of the *Mysteries*, bore this title, a name equivalent to ΤΕΛΕΤΑΙ, or ἹΕΡΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ. And surely he made use of his advantages with great judgment; for such a fiction animates the relation, which, delivered out of allegory, had been too cold and insipid for epic poetry.

We see, from Æneas's urging the example of those Heroes and Lawgivers, who had been initiated before him, that his request was only for an *initiation:*

Si potuit manis arcessere conjugis Orpheus,
Threïcia fretus cithara fidibusque canoris:

* Lib. xi. prope finem.

Si

Si fratrem Pollux alterna morte redemit,
Itque reditque viam toties: quid Thesea magnum,
Quid memorem Alciden? & mi genus ab Jove summo.

It is to be observed, that Theseus is the only one of these ancient Heroes not recorded in history to have been initiated, though we have shewn that *his descent into hell* was, like that of the rest, only a view of the *Mysteries*. The reason is, his entrance was a violent intrusion.

Had an old poem, under the name of Orpheus, intitled, A DESCENT INTO HELL, been now extant, it would, probably, have shewn us, that no more was meant than Orpheus's *initiation*; and that the idea of this sixth book was taken from thence.

But further, it was customary for the poets of the Augustan age to exercise themselves on the subject of the *Mysteries*, as appears from Cicero, who desires Atticus, then at Athens, and *initiated*, to send to Chilius, a poet of eminence*, an account of the *Eleusinian* mysteries; in order, as it would seem, to insert into some poem he was then writing †. Thus it appears, that both the ancient and contemporary poets afforded Virgil a pattern for this famous episode.

Even Servius saw thus far into Virgil's design, as to say, that *many* things were here delivered *according*

* See lib. i. ep. 16. ad Atticum, Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 23.

† Chilius te rogat & ego ejus rogatu ΕΥΜΟΛΠΙΑΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΙΑ. lib. i. epist. 9. ad Atticum, Edit. Ox. 4to. T. III. p. 9. On which Victorius observes, "πάτρια fere omnes excusi, quemadmodum est "in antiquis, habent: ut intelligat ritus patrios & institutiones "illius sacræ familiæ, & augusta mysteria, ut inquit Cicero, "ii. De legg."

*to the profound learning of the Egyptian theology**. And we have shewn, that the doctrines taught in the *Mysteries*, were invented by that people. But though I say this was our poet's general design, in this famous episode, I would not be supposed to mean, that he followed no other guides in the particular circumstances of it. Several of them are borrowed from Homer: and several from the philosophic notions of Plato: some of these will be taken notice of, in their place.

The great Agent in this affair is the SIBYL: and, as a Virgin, she sustains two principal and distinct parts: that of the inspired *Priestess*, to pronounce the ORACLE (whose connexion with the *Mysteries* is spoken of above); and that of *Hierophant*, to conduct the Initiated through the whole CELEBRATION.

Her first part begins,

> Ventum erat ad limen, cum Virgo, *Poscere fata*
> Tempus, ait. Deus, ecce, Deus—
> O tandem magnis pelagi defuncte periclis, *&c.*

and ends,

> Ut primum cessit furor, & rabida ora quierunt.

Her second part begins at,

> Sate sanguine divûm,
> Tros Anchisiade, *&c.*

and continues through the whole book. For as we have observed, the Initiated had a guide or conductor, called Ἱεροφάντης, Μυσταγωγὸς, Ἱερεὺς, indifferently of

* Multa per altam scientiam theologicorum Ægyptiorum.

either

either sex *, who was to instruct him in the preparatory ceremonies, and lead him through, and explain to him, all the shows and representations of the *Mysteries*. Hence Virgil calls the Sibyl MAGNA SACERDOS, and DOCTA COMES, words of equivalent signification: and this, because the *Mysteries* of Ceres were always celebrated in Rome by female priests †. And as the female *Mystagogue*, as well as the male ‡, was devoted to a single life, so was the Cumæan Sibyl, whom he calls *Casta Sibylla*. Another reason why a Priestess is given to conduct him, is, because Proserpine presides in this whole affair. And the name of the Priestess in the *Eleusinian Mysteries* shews that she properly belonged to Proserpine, though she was also called the Priestess of Ceres. "The Ancients "(says Porphyrius) called the Priestesses of Ceres, "Μέλισσαι, as being the ministers or Hierophants of "the subterraneous goddess; and Proserpine herself,

* Τὰς ἱερείας [Δήμητρος] Μελίσσας ἐκάλεν οἱ ποιηταί. Schol. Eurip. Hippol. Μελίσσας κυρίως τὰς τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερείας φησί. Schol. Pind. Pythion.

† So the satirist,
Paucæ adeo Cereris vittas contingere dignæ. Juv. Sat. vi.

‡ Hierophanta apud Athenas eviratur virum, & æterna debilitate fit castus. Hieron. ad Geron. De Monogamia. Cereris sacerdotes, viventibus etiam viris, & consentientibus, amica separatione viduantur. Tertul. De Monogamia, sub finem. Καὶ τὸν ΙΕΡΟΦΑΝΤΗΝ καὶ τὰς ΙΕΡΟΦΑΝΤΙΔΑΣ, καὶ τὸν δᾳδοῦχον, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἱερείας μυρρίνης ἔχειν στέφανον· διὰ ἃ καὶ τῇ Δήμητρι προσθέσθαι ταύτην φησί. Schol. Sophocl. Oedip. Col. v. 674.—It was for this reason that these female Hierophants were called Μέλισσαι, as is well observed by the Schol. on Pind. in Pyth. the Bee being, among the ancients, the symbol of chastity:

Quod nec concubitu indulgent, nec corpora segnes
In Venerem solvunt.

"Μελιτώδης."

"Μελιτώδης *." And Æneas addresses her in the language of the Aspirant, to the Hierophant:

Potes namque omnia: nec te
Nequidquam lucis Hecate præfecit Avernis.

and she answers much in the style of those sacred Ministers,

Quod si tantus amor, &c.
& INSANO juvat indulgere labori;
Accipe quæ peragenda prius.

For *insanus* is the same as ὀργιαστικὸς, and this, as we are told by Strabo, was an inseparable circumstance in the celebration of the *Mysteries* †.

The first instruction the Priestess gives Æneas, is to search for the GOLDEN BOUGH, sacred to Proserpine;

Aureus & foliis & lento vimine ramus,
Junoni infernæ sacer.

Servius can make nothing of this circumstance. He supposes it might possibly allude to a tree in the middle of the sacred grove of Diana's temple in Greece; where, if a fugitive came for sanctuary, and could get off a branch from the tree, which was carefully guarded by the priests, he was to contend in single combat with one of them; and, if he overcame, was to take his place ‡. Though nothing can be more foreign to the matter in question than this rambling account, yet

* Τὰς Δήμητρος ἱερείας, ὡς χθονίας θεᾶς μύστιδας, Μέλισσας οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκάλεσαν, αὐτήν τε τὴν Κόρην Μελιτώδη. De Antro nymph.

† Τῇ Δήμητρι νὴ Δία τὸ ΟΡΓΙΑΣΤΙΚΟΝ πᾶν, καὶ τὸ Βακχικὸν, καὶ τὸ χορικὸν, καὶ τὸ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς μυστικόν. lib. x. p. 468. B. Edit. Paris. 1620. fol.

‡ See note [Z] at the end of this Book.

the

the Abbé Banier is content to follow it *, for want of a better †. But the truth is, under this *branch*, is figured the *wreath of myrtle*, with which the Initiated were crowned, at the celebration of the *Mysteries* ‡. 1. The *golden bough* is said to be sacred to Proserpine, and so, we are told, was the *myrtle:* Proserpine only is mentioned all the way; partly, because the *Initiation* is described as an actual descent into hell; but principally, because, when the RITES of the *Mysteries* were performed, Ceres and Proserpine were equally invoked; but when the SHOWS were represented, as in the first part of this Episode, then Proserpine alone presided. 2. The quality of this *golden bough*, with its *lento vimine*, admirably describes the *tender branches of myrtle*. 3. The doves of Venus are made to direct Æneas to the tree:

Tum maximus heros
Maternas agnoscit *aves*.

They fly to it, and delight to rest upon it, as their mistress's favourite tree.

Sedibus optatis gemina super arbore sidunt.

For the *myrtle*, as is known to every one, was consecrated to Venus. And there is a greater propriety and beauty in this disposition, than appears at first sight. For not only the *myrtle* was dedicated to Proserpine as well as Venus, but the *doves* likewise, as Porphyry informs us §.

* Explicat. histor. des fables, vol. ii. p. 133. Ed. 1715.

† See note [AA] at the end of this Book.

‡ Μυρσίνης στεφάνῳ ἐστεφανῶθαι οἱ μεμυημένοι. Schol. Aristoph. Ranis.

§ Τῆς δὲ Περσεφάττης, παρὰ τὸ φέρεσθαι τὴν φάτταν, φασὶν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν θεολόγων. ἱερὸν γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ φάττα. Porph. De Abst. lib. iv. § 16.

But

But the reader may ask, why is this myrtle-branch represented to be of *gold?* not merely for the sake of the *marvellous*, he may be assured. A *golden bough* was literally part of the sacred equipage in the *shows*, a burthen which the *Ass*, *who carried the mysteries*, we may be sure, was chiefly proud of. This branch was sometimes wreathed into a crown, and worn on the head; at other times, it was carried in the hand. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us*, from Dionysius Thrax the grammarian, that it was an Egyptian custom to hold a branch in the act of adoration. And of what kind *these branches* were, Apuleius tells us, in his description of a procession of the Initiated in the *Mysteries* of Isis. "Ibat tertius, attollens PALMAM AURO SUBTILITER FOLIATAM, nec non mercurialem etiam CADUCEUM†." The *Golden branch*, then, and the *Caduceus* were related. And accordingly Virgil makes the former do the usual office of the latter, in affording a free passage into the regions of the dead. Again, Apuleius, describing the fifth person in the procession, says, "Quintus auream vannum AUREIS con-" gestam RAMULIS‡." So that a *golden bough*, we see, was an important implement, and of very complicated intention in the SHOWS of the *Mysteries*.

Æneas having now possessed himself of the GOLDEN BOUGH, a passport as necessary to his *descent* as a *myrtle crown* to *initiation*,

(Sed non ante datur telluris operta subire,
Auricomos quam quis decerpserit arbore fœtus,)

* — παρὰ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ τὸ τῶν θαλλῶν τῶν διδομένων τοῖς προσκυνοῦσι. Strom. lib. v. p. 568. p. 414, D. Edit. Sylburg.

† Metam. lib. xi. p. 383. ‡ Ibid.

carries

carries it into the Sibyl's grot:

Et vatis portat sub tecta sibyllæ.

And this was to design initiation into the *lesser Mysteries:* for Dion Chrysostom * tells us, it was performed ἐν οἰκήματί μικρῷ, in a little narrow chapel, such a one as we must suppose the Sibyl's grot to be. The *Initiated* into these rites were called ΜΥΣΤΑΙ.

He is then led to the opening of the descent:

Speluncæ *alta* fuit, *vastoque immanis hiatu*
Scrupea, tuta lacu nigro nemorumque tenebris.

And his reception is thus described:

Sub pedibus mugire solum & juga cœpta moveri
Sylvarum; visæque canes ululare per umbram,
Adventante dea.

All this is exactly similar to the fine description of the poet Claudian, where he professedly, and without disguise, speaks of the tremendous entry into these mystic Rites:

Jam mihi cernuntur trepidis delubra moveri
Sedibus, & claram dispergere fulmina lucem,
Adventum testata Dei. Jam magnus ab imis
Auditur fremitus terris, *templumque remugit*
Cecropium; *sanctasque faces attollit* ELEUSIN;
Angues Triptolemi stridunt, & squamea curvis
Colla levant attrita jugis—
Ecce procul ternas Hecate variata figuras
Exoritur †.

Both these descriptions agree exactly with the relations

* Orat. 12.

† De raptu Proserp. sub initio.

of

of the ancient Greek writers on this subject. Dion Chrysostom, speaking of *initiation* into the *Mysteries*, gives us this general idea of it: Just so " it is, as when " one leads a Greek or Barbarian to be initiated in a " certain mystic dome, excelling in beauty and magni- " ficence; where he sees many mystic sights, and " hears in the same manner a multitude of voices; " where darkness and light alternately affect his senses; " and a thousand other uncommon things present " themselves before him *."

Our poet next relates the fanatic agitation of the *Mystagogue*, on this occasion:

Procul, o procul este, profani,
Conclamat Vates, totoque absistite luco.
Tantum effata furens antro se immisit aperto.

So again, Claudian, where he counterfeits the raptures and astonishment of the *Initiated*, and throws himself, as it were, like the Sibyl, into the middle of the scene:

- - - / - - Gressus removete, profani,
Jam furor humanos nostro de pectore sensus
Expulit.

The PROCUL, O PROCUL ESTE, PROFANI of the Sibyl, is a literal translation of the formula used by the Mystagogue, at the opening of the *Mysteries:*

ΕΚΑΣ, ΕΚΑΣ ΕΣΤΕ, ΒΕΒΗΛΟΙ.

But now the poet having determined to accompany his Hero through all the mysterious rites of his *initiation*,

* Σχεδὸν ἓν ὅμοιον, ὥσπερ εἴτις ἄνδρα Ἕλληνα, ἢ Βάρβαρον μυεῖσθαι παραδιδοὺς εἰς μυστικόν τινα οἶκον, ὑπερφυῆ κάλλει καὶ μεγέθει, πολλὰ μὲν ὁρῶντα μυστικὰ θεάματα, πολλῶν δὲ ἀκούοντα τοιούτων φωνῶν, σκότος τε καὶ φῶς ἐναλλὰξ αὐτῷ φαινομένων, ἄλλων τε μυρίων γινομένων. Orat. 12.

and

and conscious of the imputed impiety, in bringing them out to open day, stops short in his narration, and breaks out into this solemn apology:

Dii, quibus imperium est animarum, umbræque silentes;
Et Chaos & Phlegethon loca nocte silentia late,
Sit mihi fas audita loqui: sit numine vestro
Pandere res alta terra & caligine mersas —

And here let me observe, that this pretended apprehension of the Ancients, that they were doing an unlawful thing when they revealed the secrets of the *Realm of Dis*, arose from the custom of the Mysteries, where these sights were represented. For they had none of these scruples where they speak of the Habitations of the Celestial Gods. Claudian, who (as we have observed) professes openly to treat of the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, at a time when they were in little veneration, yet, in compliance to old custom, excuses his undertaking in the same manner:

Dii, quibus in numerum, *&c.*
Vos mihi sacrarum penetralia pandite rerum,
Et vestri secreta poli, qua lampade Ditem
Flexit Amor, quo ducta ferox Proserpina raptu
Possedit dotale Chaos; quantasque per oras
Sollicito genetrix erraverit anxia cursu;
Unde datæ populis leges, et, glande relicta,
Cesserit inventis Dodonia quercus aristis *.

Had the revealing the *Mysteries* been as penal at Rome, as it was in Greece, Virgil had never ventured on this part of his poem. But yet it was

* De raptu Proserpinæ, lib. i. sub init.

esteemed

esteemed impious*; and what is more, it was infamous.

— vetabo qui Cereris sacrum
Vulgarit arcanæ, sub iisdem
Sit trabibus fragilemque mecum.
Solvat phaselum —— HOR.

He therefore does it covertly; and makes this apology to such as saw into his meaning.

The Hero and his Guide now enter on their journey;

Ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbras:
Perque domos Ditis vacuas, & inania regna.
Quale per incertam lunam sub luce maligna
Est iter in sylvis: ubi cœlum condidit umbra
Jupiter, & rebus nox abstulit atra colorem.

This description will receive much light from a passage in Lucian's dialogue of *the Tyrant*. As a company made up of every condition of life are voyaging together to the other world, Mycillus breaks out and says; "Bless us! how dark it is! What is become of the "fair Megillus? In this situation, who can tell, whe- "ther Simmiche or Phryne be the handsomer? Every "thing is alike, and of one colour; there is no room "for comparing Beauties. My old cloak, which but "now presented to your eyes so irregular a figure, is "become as honourable a wear as his Majesty's purple. "They are, indeed, both vanished †, and retired to- "gether

* Athenis initiatus [Augustus] cum postea Romæ pro tribunali de privilegio sacerdotum Atticæ Cereris cognosceret, & quædam secretoria proponerentur, dimisso concilio & corona circumstantium, solus audiit disceptantes. Sueton. lib. ii. Octav. Aug. cap 93.

† The original has a peculiar elegance. Ἄφανη γὰρ ἄμφω, &c. alludes to the ancient Greek notions concerning the *first matter*,

" gether under the same cover. But my friend, the " Cynic, where are You! give me your hand: *you* " *are initiated in the* ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES. " *Tell me now, do you not think this very like the blind* " *march the good company make there?* CY. *Oh,* " *extremely; and see, here comes one of the Furies,* " *as I guess by her equipage, her torch, and her ter-* " *rible looks* *."

The Sibyl, on their approach to the mouth of the cave, had advised Æneas to summon up all his courage, as being to undergo the severest trial:

Tuque invade viam, vaginaque eripe ferrum:
Nunc animis opus, Ænea, nunc pectore firmo.

These trials were of two sorts: the encountering *real* labours and difficulties; and the being exposed to *imaginary and false* terrors. This latter was objected to all the Initiated in general: the other was reserved for

which they called ἀφανὴς, *invisible*, as being without the qualities of *form* and *colour*. The investing Matter with these qualities, was the production of bodies, the τὰ φαινόμενα: and their dissolution, a return to a state of *invisibility*.— εἰς ΑΦΑΝΕΣ χωρεῖ τὰ διαλυόμενα, as the pretended Merc. Trismag. has it, cap. xi. *Matter*, in this state of invisibility, was, by the earlier Greeks, called ΑΔΗΣ. Afterwards, the state itself was so called; and at length it came to signify the abode of departed spirits.

* MI. Ἡράκλεις τῦ ζόφυ· πῶ νῦν ὁ καλὸς Μέγιλλος, ἢ τῷ διαγυῷ τις ἐνταῦθα εἰ καλλίων Φρύνης Σιμμίχη, πάντα γὰρ ἴσα, καὶ ὁμόχροα, καὶ ἀδὲν ἔτε καλὸν, ἔτε καλλίον· ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τὸ τριβώνιον, πρότερον τέως ἄμορφον εἶναι δοκεῖν, ἰσότιμον γίγνεται τῇ πορφυρίδι τῦ βασιλέως· ἀφανῆ γὰρ ἄμφω, καὶ ὑπὸ τῷ αὐτῷ σκότῳ κατακεκλυκότα. ΚΥ. Κυνίσκε, σὺ δὲ πῶ πότε ἄρα ὢν τυγχάνεις;— ἔμβαλέ μοι τὴν δεξιάν· εἰπέ μοι, ἐτελέσθης γὰρ, ὦ Κυνίσκε, τὰ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΑ, ἐχ ΟΜΟΙΑ τοῖς ἐκεῖ ἐνθαδέ σοι δοκεῖ; ΚΥΝ. εὖ λέγεις· ἰδὲ ἓν προσέρχεται δαδουχῦσά τις, φοβερόν τι, καὶ ἀπειλητικὸν προσβλέπουσα· ἢ ἆρα πῶ Ἐρινύς ἐστιν; Luciani Cataplus, T. I. p. 643. Edit. Reitzii, 4°, Amstel. 1743.

for Chiefs and Leaders. On which account, Virgil describes them both, in their order; as they were both to be undergone by his Hero. The real labours are figured under these words:

Vestibulum ante ipsum, primisque in faucibus Orci,
Luctus & ultrices posuere cubilia Curæ:
Pallentesque habitant Morbi *, tristisque Senectus,
Et metus, & malesuada Fames, & turpis Egestas:
Terribiles visu formæ; Lethumque, Labosque:
Tum consanguineus Lethi Sopor, & mala mentis
Gaudia, mortiferumque adverso in limine Bellum,
Ferreique Eumenidum thalami, & Discordia demens ——

To understand the force of this description, it will be necessary to transcribe the account the ancients have left us of the probationary trials in the *Mysteries* of MITHRAS, whose participation was more particularly aspired to, by Chiefs and Leaders of armies; whence these Initiated were commonly called the SOLDIERS OF MITHRAS †. "No one, says Nonnus, could be "initiated into these *Mysteries* [of Mithras] till he "had passed gradually through the probationary "labours [by which he was to acquire a certain *apathe* "and sanctity.] There were eighty degrees of these "labours, from less to greater: and when the aspirant "has gone through them all, he is initiated. These "labours are—to pass through fire, to endure cold,

* Quint. is mistaken in supposing pallentesque, &c. a *metonomy*. Had this been the description of an *Hospital*, he had been right: For then, indeed, in these words, the *cause* would have been put for the *effect*.

† Erubescite, Romani commilitones ejus, jam non ab ipso judicandi, sed ab aliquo MITHRÆ MILITE: qui cum initiatur in spelæo, &c. Tertull. De corona militis.

"hunger,

" hunger, and thirst, to undergo much journeyings; and " in a word, every toil of this nature *."

The second sort of trials were the *panic terrors*, of the *Mysteries*; and these, Virgil represents next. And to distinguish them from the figurative description of the *real labours* preceding, he separates the two accounts by that fine circumstance of the *tree of dreams*, which introduces the second sort:

In medio ramos annosaque brachia pandit
Ulmus opaca, ingens: quam sedem somnia vulgo
Vana tenere ferunt, foliisque sub omnibus hærent.
Multaque præterea variarum monstra ferarum,
Centauri in foribus stabulant, Scyllæque biformes,
Et centum geminus Briareus, & bellua Lernæ;
Horrendum stridens, flammisque, armata Chimæra:
Gorgones, Harpyiæque, & forma tricorporis umbræ.

These *terribiles visu formæ* are the same which *Pletho*, in the place quoted above, calls ἀλλόκοτα τὰς μορφὰς φάσματα, as they were seen in the entrance of the *Mysteries*; and which Celsus tells us, were likewise presented in the Bacchic rites; τοῖς ἐν ταῖς Βακχικαῖς Τελεταῖς τὰ φάσματα καὶ δείματα προεισάγεσι †.

But it is reasonable to suppose, that though these things had the use here assigned to them, it was some

* Ἐ δύναται ἔν τις εἰς αὐτὸν τελεσθῆναι, εἰ μὴ πρότερον διὰ τῶν βαθμῶν τῶν κολάσεων παρέλθοι. βαθμοὶ δὲ εἰσι κολάσεων τὸν μὲν ἀριθμὸν ἑγδοήκοντα, ἔχοντες δὲ ὑπόβασιν καὶ ἀνάβασιν· κολάζονται γὰρ πρῶτον τὰς ἐλαφροτέρας, εἶτα τὰς δρασικωτέρας. καὶ εἶθ' ὕστερον μετὰ τὸ παρελθεῖν διὰ πασῶν τῶν κολάσεων, τότε τελεῖται ὁ τελούμενος· αἱ δὲ κολάσεις εἰσὶ τὸ διὰ πυρὸς παρελθεῖν, τὲ διὰ κρύους, διὰ πείνης καὶ δίψης, διὰ ὁδοιπορίας πολλῆς, καὶ ἁπλῶς διὰ πασῶν τῶν τοιούτων. Nonnus, in Secundam Nazianz. Steleteuticam. And again he says, ἐδεὶς δὲ δύναται τελεῖσθαι τὰς τῆ Μίθρᾳ τελετὰς, εἰ μὴ διὰ πασῶν τῶν κολάσεων παρέλθοι, καὶ δείξοι ἑαυτὸν ἀπαθῆ τίνα καὶ ὅσιον, &c.

† Origen. contra Cels. lib. iv. p. 167.

circumstance in the recondite physiology of the East, which preferred them to this station. We are to consider then this dark entrance into the *Mysteries*, as a representation of the CHAOS, thus described:

Ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram,
Perque domos Ditis *vacuas* & *inania* regna.

And amongst the several Powers invoked by the Poet, at his entrance on this scene, CHAOS is one:

Di, quibus imperium est animorum umbræque silentes:
Et CHAOS & Phlegethon, *loca nocte tacentia late.*

Now a fragment of Berosus, preserved by George Syncellus, describes the ancient CHAOS, according to the physiology of the Chaldeans, in this manner;— "There was a time, they say, when all was water "and darkness. And these gave birth and habita- "tion to MONSTROUS ANIMALS OF MIXED FORMS "AND SPECIES. For there were men with two wings, "others with four, and some again with double faces. "Some had the horns of goats, some their legs, and "some the legs of horses; others had the hind-parts "of horses, and the foreparts of men, like the hippo- "centaurs. There were bulls with human heads, "dogs with four bodies ending in fishes, horses with "dogs' heads; *and men, and other creatures with the* "*heads and bodies of horses, and with the tails of* "*fishes.* And a number of animals, whose bodies "were a MONSTROUS COMPOUND of the dissimilar "parts of beasts of various kinds. Together with "these, were fishes, reptiles, serpents, and other "creatures, which, by a reciprocal translation of the "parts to one another, became all portentously de- "formed:

" formed: the pictures and representations of which " were hung up in the temple of Belus. A woman " ruled over the whole, whose name was Omoroca, in " the Chaldee tongue Thalath, which, in Greek, sig- " nifies the Sea; and (on account of their powerful " connexion) the Moon *." This account seems to have been exactly copied in the *Mysteries*, as appears from the description of the poet:

Multaque prætérea variárum monstra ferárum
Centauri in foribus stabulant, Scyllæque biformes,
Et centum geminus Briareus, & bellua Lernæ
Horrendum stridens, flammisque armata Chimæra:
Gorgones, Harpyiæque, & forma TRICORPORIS umbræ.

The CANINE figures have a considerable station in this region of monsters: And he tells us,

—visæque CANES ululare per umbram:

which Pletho explains in his scholia on the magic oracles of Zoroaster. " It is the custom, in the celebra-

* Γενέσθαι φησὶ χρόνον, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πᾶν, σκότος καὶ ὕδωρ εἶναι, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ζῶα τερατώδη, καὶ εἰδισφυεῖς τὰς ἰδέας ἔχοντα ζωογονεῖσθαι. Ἀνθρώπους γὰρ διπλέρους γεινηθῆναι, ἐνίους δὲ καὶ τετραπλέρους, καὶ διπροσώπους.—τοὺς μὲν αἰγῶν σκέλη καὶ κέρατα ἔχοντας, τοὺς δὲ ἱππόποδας, τοὺς δὲ τὰ ὀπίσω μὲν μέρη ἵππων, τὰ δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἀνθρώπων, ὃς ἱπποκενταύρους τὴν ἰδέαν εἶναι. Ζωογονηθῆναι δὲ καὶ ταύρους, ἀνθρώπων κεφαλὰς ἐχόντας· καὶ κύνας τετρασωμάτους ὑρὰς ἰχθύος ἐκ τῶν ὄπισθιν μερῶν ἐχόντας, καὶ ἵππους κυνοκεφάλους, καὶ ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἕτερα ζῶα, κεφαλὰς μὲν καὶ σώματα ἵππων ἔχοντα, ὑρὰς δὲ ἰχθύων καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ζῶα παντοδαπῶν θηρίων μορφὰς ἔχοντα. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, ἰχθύας, καὶ ἑρπετὰ, καὶ ὄφεις, καὶ ἄλλα ζῶα τοιαῦτα θαυμαστὰ καὶ παρηλλαγμένα τὰς ὄψεις ἀλλήλων ἔχοντα, ὧν καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας, ἐν τῷ τοῦ Βήλου ναῷ ἀνάκεισθαι. Ἄρχειν δὲ τούτων πάντων γυναῖκα, ᾗ ὄνομα Ὁμορώπα. Εἶναι δὲ τοῦτο Χαλδαϊστὶ μὲν Θαλάθ, ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ μεθερμηνευόμενον θάλασσα, καλὰ δὲ Ἰσόψηφον Σελήνην. Georg. Syncel. Chronogr.

" tion of the *Mysteries*, to present before many of the " Initiated, phantasms of a CANINE figure, and other " monstrous shapes and appearances *."

The woman, whose name *Thalath* coincides with that of the *Moon*, was the *Hecate* of the Greeks, who is invoked by Æneas on this occasion:

Voce vocans HECATEN, *cælo Ereboque* potentem.

Hence terrifying visions were called *Hecatea* †. The reason why Hecate, or the Moon, came to be one of the Governesses in these rites, was, because some had placed Elysium in the Moon; the Elysian fields being from thence called the *fields of Hecate*. The ancients called Hecate, *Diva* TRIFORMIS. And Scaliger observes that this word *Thalath*, which Syncellus, or Berosus, says, was equivalent to the Moon, signifies TRIA.

And now we soon find the Hero in a fright;

Corripit hic subita trepidus formidine ferrum
Æneas, strictamque aciem venientibus offert.

With these affections the Ancients represent the *Initiated* as possessed on his first entrance into these holy Rites. " Entering now into the mystic dome " (says Themistius) he is filled with horror and amaze- " ment. He is seized with solicitude, and a total " perplexity: he is unable to move a step forward, " and at a loss to find the entrance to that road which " is to lead him to the place he aspires to. Till the " Prophet [the *vates*] or Conductor, laying open the

* Εἴωθε τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν τελουμένων φαίνεσθαι καὶ τὰς τελεστὰς κυνώδη τινὰ, καὶ ἄλλως ἀλλόκοτα τὰς μορφὰς φάσματα.

† Schol. Apollon. Argon. l. iii. v. 859.

" vestibule

" vestibule of the temple*"—To the same purpose Proclus: " — As in the most holy *Mysteries*, before " the scene of the mystic visions, there is a terror " infused over the minds of the Initiated, so," &c †.

The adventurers come now to the banks of Cocytus. Æneas is surprized at the crowd of ghosts which hover round it, and appear impatient for a passage. His Guide tells him they are those who have not had the rites of sepulture performed to their manes, and so are doomed to wander up and down for a hundred years, before they be permitted to cross the river:

Nec ripas datur horrendas, nec rauca fluenta
Transportare prius, quam sedibus ossa quierunt.
Centum errant annos, volitantque hæc litora circum.
Tum demum admissi stagna exoptata revisunt.

We are not to think this old notion took its rise from the vulgar superstition. It was one of the wisest contrivances of ancient politics; and came originally from Egypt, the fountain-head of legislation. Those profound masters of wisdom, in projecting for the common good, found nothing would more contribute to the safety of their fellow citizens than the public and solemn interment of the dead; as without this provision, private murders might be easily and securely committed. They therefore introduced the custom of pompous funeral rites: and, as Herodotus and Diodorus tell us, were of all people the most circum-

* Ὁ μὲν ἄρτι προσιὼν τοῖς ἀδύτοις, φρίκης τε ἀνεπίμπλατο καὶ ἰλίγγου· ἀδημονίᾳ τὲ εἴχετο καὶ ἀπορίᾳ συμπάσῃ, οὐδὲ ἴχνους λαβέσθαι οἷός τε ὢν, οὔτε ἀρχῆς ἡστινοσοῦν ἐπιδράξασθαι εἴσω φερούσης ὁπότε δὲ ὁ προφήτης ἐκεῖνος ἀναπετάσας τὰ προπύλαια τοῦ νεώ. Orat. in Patrem.

† Ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς ἁγιωτάταις τελεταῖς πρὸ τῶν μυστικῶν θεαμάτων ἔκπληξις τῶν μυουμένων, οὕτω.—In Plat. Theol. lib. iii. cap. 18.

stantially ceremonious in the observance of them. To secure these by the force of Religion, as well as civil custom, they taught, that the deceased could not retire to a place of rest, till these rites were performed. The notion spread so wide, and fixed its root so deep, that the substance of the superstition remains, even to this day, in most civilized countries. By so effectual a method did the Legislature gain its end, the security of the citizen. There is a circumstance in classical antiquity which will sufficiently inform us of how great moment these rites were esteemed. HOMER, SOPHOCLES, and EURIPIDES, are confessed to be the greatest masters of their art, and to have given us the best models of it. Yet, in the judgement of modern critics, the funeral rites for Patroclus, in the Iliad, and for Ajax and Polynices, in the Ajax and the Phœnicians, are a vicious continuation of the story, which violates the *unity of the action*. But they did not consider, that funeral rites were anciently deemed an inseparable part of the Hero's story: And therefore those great masters of design could not understand the action to be complete, till that important office to the dead was dispatched *. Nay so dreadful was the apprehension of the want of *funeral Rites*, that the Historians tell us, it was one of the principal causes of the Spartan bashfulness, in that War in which *Tyrtæus* was employed to restore them to their ancient Spirit. Who

* Προσεθῆναι δὲ ἔτι τούτῳ τῷ νομῳ τόνδε, τὸν διδόντα τὸ χρέων, μὴ ἀπάσης κρατέειν τῆς τοῦ λαμβάνοντος θήκης· τῷ δὲ ὑποτιθέντι τοῦτο τὸ ἐνέχυρον τοῦνδε ἐπεῖναι ζημίην, μὴ βουλομένῳ ἀποδοῦναι τὸ χρέων, μηδὲ αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ, τελευτήσαντι εἶναι ταφῆς κυρῆσαι μήτ' ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ πατρώῳ τάφῳ, μήτ' ἐν ἄλλῳ μηδενὶ, μήτ' ἄλλον μηδένα τὸν ἐωυτοῦ ἀπαγενόμενον θάψαι. Herod. lib. ii. cap. 136. Edit. Gale, p. 142. lin. 8.

when

when he had dissipated this superstitious terror by the magic of his martial numbers, they rushed on to the charge with a resolution to conquer or to die.

But the Egyptian Sage found, afterwards, another use in this opinion; and by artfully turning it to a punishment on insolvent debtors, strengthened public credit, to the great advantage of commerce, and consequently of civil community. For, instead of that general custom of modern barbarians to bury insolvents alive, this polite and humane people had a law of greater efficacy, which denied burial to them when dead. And here the learned Marsham seems to be mistaken, when he supposes, that the Grecian opinion of the wandering of unburied ghosts arose from this interdiction of sepulchral rites *. On the contrary it appears, that the law was founded on the opinion, originally Egyptian, and not the opinion on the law; for the law had no other sanction than the opinion.

In a word, had not our poet conceived it a matter of much importance, he had hardly dwelt so long upon it, or returned again to it †, or laid so much stress on it, or made his hero so attentively consider it:

> Constitit Anchisa satus, & vestigia pressit,
> Multa Putans.

But having added,

> — Sortemque animo miseratus *iniquam*;

and Servius commented, "Iniqua enim sors est puniri "propter alterius negligentiam: nec enim quis culpa

* Ab interdictæ apud Ægyptios sepulturæ pœnâ, inolevit apud Græcos opinio insepultorum corporum animas à Charonte non esse admissas. Canon Chronicus, Seculum xi. sec. 3.

† Ver. 373. & seq.

"sua,

" sua caret sepulchro;" Mr. Bayle cries out *, " What " injustice is this! was it the fault of these souls, that " their bodies were not interred?" But neither of them knowing the origin of this opinion, nor seeing its use, the latter ascribes *that* to the blindness of Religion, which was the issue of wise Policy. Virgil, by his *sors iniqua*, means no more than that in this, as well as in several other civil institutions, *a public benefit was often a private injury.*

The next thing observable is the ferry-man, Charon; and he, the learned well know, was a man of this world, an Egyptian of a well-known Character. This People, like the rest of mankind, in their descriptions of the other world, used to copy from something they were well acquainted with in this. In their funeral rites, which, as we observed, was a matter of greater moment with them than with any other people, they used to carry their dead over the Nile, and through the marsh of Acherusia, and there put them into subterraneous caverns; the ferry-man employed in this business being, in their language, called Charon. Now in their *Mysteries*, the description of the passage into the other world was borrowed, as was natural, from the circumstances of their funeral rites. So that the Charon *below* might very well refuse to charge his Boat with those whom his namesake *above* had not admitted. And it might be easily proved, if there was occasion, that the Egyptians themselves transferred these realities into the ΜΥΘΟΣ, and not the Greeks, as later writers generally imagine.

Charon is appeased at the sight of the *golden bough:*

Ille admirans venerabile donum
Fatalis virgæ, LONGO POST TEMPORE visum.

* Respons. aux Quest. d'un Provincial, p. iii. cap. 22.

But it is represented as the passport of all the ancient Heroes who had descended into hell; how then could it be said to be *longo post tempore visum*, Æneas being so near the times of those Heroes? To explain this, we must have in mind what hath been said above of a perfect Lawgiver's being held out in Æneas, and of Augustus's being delineated in the Trojan chief. So that here Virgil is pointing to his Master; and what he would insinuate, is, that the Roman emperor, initiated in the Eleusinian rites, should, in a later age, rival the fame of the first Grecian Lawgivers.

But Æneas hath now crossed the river, and is come into the proper regions of the dead. The first Apparition that occurs is the dog Cerberus:

> Hæc ingens latratu regna trifauci
> Personat, adverso recubans immanis in antro.

This is plainly one of the phantoms of the *Mysteries*, which, Pletho tells us above, was in the shape of a dog, κυνώδη τινά. And in the fable of Hercules's descent into hell, which, we have shewn, signified no more than his Initiation into the *Mysteries*, it is said to have been amongst other things, for fetching up the dog Cerberus.

The Prophetess, to appease his rage, gives him a medicated cake, which casts him into a slumber:

> Cui vates, horrere videns jam colla colubris,
> *Melle soporatam et medicatis frugibus offam*
> Objicit.

In the *Mysteries* of Trophonius (who was said to be nursed by Ceres *, that is, as I understand it, to derive

* Δήμητρι—τὸ Τροφωνίῳ εἶναι τροφόν. Pausan. Bœot. c. 39. pag. 790. Edit. Kuhnii, folio, Lips. 1696.

his

his rites from the Eleusinian) the Initiated carried the same sort of medicated Cakes to appease the serpents he met with in his passage *. Tertullian, who gives all *Mysteries* to the devil; and very equitably, as the good man makes *him* the author of all that is done there, mentions the offering up of these cakes, *celebrat et panis oblationem* †. This in question was of *poppy-seed*, made up with honey; and so I understand *medicatis frugibus*, here, on the authority of the poet himself, who, in the fourth book, makes the priestess of Venus prepare the same treat for the *dragon* who guarded the Hesperian fruit:

Spargens humida mella soporiferumque papaver.

Honey, as we have shewn above, was sacred to Proserpine, who on that account was called Μελιτώδης; and the *poppy* was consecrated to Ceres: "Cereale Papaver," says Virgil; on which words Servius thus comments: "Vel quod est usui, sicut frumentum, vel quo Ceres "usa est ad oblivionem doloris; nam ob raptum "Proserpinæ vigiliis defatigata, gustato eo acta est in "soporem ‡."

But, without doubt, the images, which the spissated juice of poppy presents to the fancy, was one reason why this drug had a place in the ceremonial of the SHOWS: not improbably, it might be given to some at least of the *Initiated*, to aid the impression of those mystic visions which passed before them. For that something like this was done, that is, giving medicated drugs to the Aspirants, we are informed by Plutarch;

* Μελιτοῦτας ἐπάγοντες ἐν ταῖν χερσῖν, μειλίγματα ἑρπέτων.——Philos. Vit. Apoll. l. viii. c. 15.

† De præscr. adver. hæret.

‡ Ad lib. i. Georg. ver. 212.

who

who speaks of a shrub called Leucophyllus used in the celebration of the *Mysteries* of *Hecate*, which drives men into a kind of frenzy, and makes them confess all the wickedness they had done or intended. And *confession* was one necessary preparative for initiation.

The regions according to Virgil's Topography, are divided into three parts: 1. PURGATORY. 2. TARTARUS. 3. ELYSIUM. For Deiphobus (in the first) says,

Discedam, EXPLEBO numerum, reddarque tenebris*.

And, in the second, it is said of Theseus,

Sedet, ÆTERNUMque sedebit
Infelix Theseus. - - -

The *Mysteries* divided them in the same manner. So Plato, in the passage † quoted above (where he speaks of what was taught in the *Mysteries*) talks of souls sticking fast in mire and filth, and remaining in darkness, till a long series of years had purged and purified them; and Celsus, in *Origen* ‡, says, that the *Mysteries* taught the doctrine of eternal punishments.

Of all the three States this of Tartarus only was *eternal*. There was, indeed, another, in the ancient pagan theology, which had the same relation to Elysium, that Tartarus had to Purgatory, the extreme of reward, as Tartarus of punishment. But then this state was not in the infernal regions, but in Heaven. Neither was it the lot of common Men, but reserved for *heroes* and *dæmons*; Beings of a superior order, such as Hercules, Bacchus, &c. who became Gods on their admission

* But the nature and end of this purgatory the poet describes at large, from ver. 736, to ver. 745.

† See note, p. 55. ‡ See note (†) p. 68.

into

into Heaven, where *eternity* was the consequence of their deification.

Cicero distinguishes the two orders of souls, according to the vulgar Theology, in this manner: "Quid autem ex hominum genere consecratos, sicut "Herculem & cæteros coli lex jubet, indicat *omnium* "quidem *animos immortales* esse: FORTIUM BONO-"RUMQUE DIVINOS*."

And here it is to our purpose to observe, that the Virtues and Vices, which stock these three Divisions with inhabitants, are such as more immediately affect Society. A plain proof that the poet followed the views of the Legislator, the institutor of the *Mysteries*.

PURGATORY, the first division, is inhabited by suicides, extravagant lovers, and ambitious warriors: And, in a word, by all those who had indulged the violence of their passions; which made them rather wretched than wicked. It is remarkable that amongst these we find one of the *Initiated:*

Cererique sacrum Polybœten.

This was agreeable to the public doctrine of the *Mysteries*, which taught, that initiation with virtue procured men great advantages over others, in a future state; but that without virtue, it was of no avail.

Of all these disorders, the poet hath more distinctly marked out the misery of SUICIDE:

Proxima diende tenent mœsti loca, qui sibi lethum
Insontes peperere manu, lucemque perosi
Projecere animas. Quam vellent æthere in alto
Nunc & pauperiem & duros perferre labores!

Here he keeps close to the mysteries; which not

* De Legg. lib. ii. cap. 12.

only

only forbad *suicide*, but taught on what account it was criminal. "That which is said in the MYSTERIES "(says Plato) concerning these matters of man's "being placed in a certain watch or station, which "it is unlawful to fly from, or forsake, is a profound "doctrine, and not easily fathomed*." *Insontes*, says the Poet, to distinguish Suicides (properly so called) from those whom the Laws condemned to be their own Executioners: for this inhuman treatment, was amongst the capital inflictions, in the Criminal Code of the Ancients.

Hitherto all goes well. But what must we say to the poet's putting *new-born infants*, and *men falsely condemned*, into his purgatory? For though the *faith and inquisition* of modern Rome send many of both sorts into a place of punishment, yet the genius of ancient paganism had a gentler aspect. It is, indeed, difficult to tell what these inmates have to do here. Let us consider the case of the *infants*; and if we find it can only be cleared up by the general view of things here given, this will be considered as another argument for the truth of our interpretation of the DESCENT:

Continuo *auditæ voces, vagitus et ingens*,
Infantumque animæ flentes in limine primo:
Quos dulcis vitæ exortes, & ab ubere raptos
Abstulit atra dies, & *funere* mersit *acerbo*.

These appear to have been the *cries and lamentings*

* Ὁ μὲν ἔν ἐν ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΟΙΣ λεγόμενος περὶ αὐτῶν λόγος, ὡς ἔστιν φρουρᾷ ἐσμὲν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ οὐ δεῖ δὴ ἑαυτὸν ἐκ ταύτης λύειν, οὐδ' ἀποδιδράσκειν, μεγάς τε τις μοι φαίνεται καὶ οὐ ῥᾴδιος διϊδεῖν· Phæd. p. 62. Ser. ed. tom. i.——See note [BB] at the end of this Book.

that,

that, Proclus tells us, were heard in the Mysteries *. So that we only want to know the original of so extraordinary a circumstance. Which I take to have been just such another provision of the Lawgiver for the security of INFANCY, as that about *funeral rites* was for the ADULT. For nothing could more engage Parents in the care and preservation of their young, than so terrible a doctrine. Nor are we to imagine, that their natural fondness needed no inforcement, or support: for that most degenerate and horrid practice among the ancients, of EXPOSING INFANTS, was universal †; and had almost erased *morality* from the minds of the best instructed, and *instinct* from the breasts of the most tenderly affected ‡. St. Paul seems to have had this in his eye, when he accused the pagan world of being WITHOUT NATURAL AFFECTION §. It needed therefore the strongest and severest check: and I am well persuaded it occasioned this counterplot of the Magistrate, in order to give instinct fair play, and call back banished nature. Nothing, indeed, could be more worthy of his care: for the destruction of children, as Pericles finely observed of youth, is *like cutting off the spring from the year*. Accordingly we are told by Diodorus, that the Egyptians had a law ‖ against this unnatural practice, which law he numbers amongst the singularities of that highly policied nation. "They are

* Καὶ τοῖς μυσηρίοις τὸν μυσικὸν ΘΡΗΝΟΝ μυσικῶς παρειλήφαμεν. In Comment. in Platonis Remp. lib. x.

† See note [CC] at the end of this Book.

‡ See what has been further said on this subject, B. I. Sect. 4.

§ Rom. i. 31.

‖ See note [DD] at the end of this Book.

"obliged

" obliged (says he) to bring up all their children, in " order to render the country populous; this being " esteemed the best means of making states flourish- " ing and happy *." And Tacitus speaks of the prohibition as no less singular amongst the Jews: " Augendæ multitudini consulitur. Nam & NECARE " QUEMQUAM EX GNATIS, NEFAS †."

Here again Mr. Bayle is much scandalized: " The " first thing which we meet on the entrance into the " other world, is the station assigned to INFANTS, " who cried and lamented without ceasing; and next " to that, the station of men unjustly condemned to " death. Now what could be more shocking or " scandalous than the punishment of those little " creatures, who had yet committed no sin, or of those " persons whose innocence had been oppressed by " calumny ‡?" The first difficulty is already cleared up: the second shall be considered by and by. But it is no wonder Mr. Bayle could not digest this doctrine of the *infants*; for I am much mistaken, if it did not stick with Plato himself; who, relating the *Vision of Erus, the Pamphilian*, concerning the distribution of rewards and punishments in another life,

* Καὶ τὰ γεγώμενα παῖδα τρέφουσιν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἕνεκα τῆς πολυανθρωπίας ὡς ταύτης μέγιστα συμβαλλομένης πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν χώρας τε καὶ πόλεων. Lib. i. Histor.

† Tacit. Hist. lib. v.

‡ La premiere chose que l'on rencontroit à l'entrée des Enfers, étoit la station des petits enfans, qui ne cessoient de pleurer, & puis celle des personnes injustement condamnées à la mort. Quoi de plus choquant, de plus scandaleux, que la peine de ces petites creatures, qui n'avoient encore commis nul péche; ou que la peine de ceux, dont l'innocence avoit été opprimée par la calomnie. Respons. aux Quæst. d'un Prov. p. 3. cap. xxii.

when he comes to the condition of infants, passes it over in these words:——" But of children who died " in their infancy, he reported certain other things " NOT WORTHY TO BE REMEMBERED *." Erus's account of what he saw in another world, was a summary of what the Egyptians taught in their *Mysteries* concerning that matter. And I make no doubt but the thing *not worthy to be remembered*, was the doctrine of *infants in purgatory:* which appears to have given Plato much scandal, who did not, at that time at least, reflect upon its original and use. But here let us take notice, for the honour of HUMANITY, that, while Pagans both old and new could be shocked at this punishment, modern papists, to the eternal disgrace of SUPERSTITION, can condemn unbaptised Infants, without remorse, to infinitely greater.

But now, as to the FALSELY CONDEMNED, we must seek another solution:

Hos juxta, falso damnati crimine mortis;
Nec vero hæ sine sorte datæ, sine judice sedes.
Quæsitor Minos urnam movet: ille silentum
Consiliumque vocat, vitasque & crimina discit.

This designment appears both iniquitous and absurd. The *falsely accused* † are not only in a place of punishment, but, being first delivered under this single predicament, they are afterwards distinguished into two sorts; some as blameable, others as innocent. To clear up this confusion, it will be necessary to

* Τῶν δὲ εὐθὺς γενομένων, καὶ ὀλίγον χρόνον βιώντων περὶ ἄλλα ἔλεγεν ΟΥΚ ΑΞΙΑ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ. De rep. lib. x. p. 615. Serr. edit.

† Servius, on the place, characterizes them in this manner—" qui sibi per simplicitatem adesse nequiverunt."

transcribe

transcribe an old story, told by Plato, in his *Gorgias:*

——" This law, concerning mortals, was enacted in " the time of Saturn, and is yet, and ever will be, in " force amongst the Gods; that he who had lived a " just and pious life, shall, at his death, be carried " into the islands of the blessed, and there possess all " kinds of happiness, untainted with the evils of " mortality: but that he who had lived unjustly and " impiously, shall be thrust into a place of punish- " ment, the prison of divine justice, called Tartarus. " Now the judges, with whom the execution of this " law was intrusted, were, in the time of Saturn, and " under the infancy of Jove's government, *living men,* " *sitting in judgment on the living*; and passing sen- " tence on them, upon the day of their decease. This " gave occasion to unjust judgments: on which ac- " count, Pluto, and those to whom the care of the " happy islands was committed, went to Jupiter, and " told him, that men came to them *wrongfully judged,* " *both when acquitted, and when condemned.* To " which the Father of the Gods thus replied: I will " put a stop to this evil. These wrong judgments are " partly occasioned by the corporeal covering of the " persons judged; for they are tried while living: " now many have their corrupt minds hid under a " fair outside, adorned with birth and riches; and, " when they come to their trial, have witnesses at " hand, to testify for their good life and conversation; " this perverts the process, and blinds the eyes of " justice. Besides, the judges themselves are encum- " bered with the same corporeal covering: and eyes " and ears, and an impenetrable tegument of flesh, " hinder the mind from a free exertion of its faculties. " All these (as well their own covering, as the covering

" of those they judge) are bars and obstacles to right
" judgment. In the first place then, says he, we are
" to provide that the foreknowledge which they now
" have of the day of death, be taken away; and this
" shall be given in charge to Prometheus; and then
" provide, that they who come to judgment, be quite
" naked*; for from henceforth they shall not be
" tried, till they come into the other world. And as
" they are to be thus stripped, it is but fit their judges
" should await them there in the same condition; that,
" at the arrival of every new inhabitant, soul may
" look on soul, and all family relation, and every
" worldly ornament being dropt and left behind,
" RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT may at length take place.
" I, therefore, who foresaw all these things before
" you felt them, have taken care to constitute my
" own sons to be the judges: two of them, Minos
" and Rhadamanthus, are Asiatics; the third, Æacus,
" an European. These, when they die, shall have
" their tribunal erected in the shades, *just in that*
" part of the highway, where the two roads divide,
" the one leading to the happy islands, the other to
" Tartarus. Rhadamanthus shall judge the Asiatics,
" and Æacus the Europeans; but to Minos I give
" the superior authority of hearing appeals, when
" any thing obscure or difficult shall perplex the
" others' judgments; that every one may have his
" abode assigned him with the utmost equity †."

The

* This evidently refers to the old Egyptian custom, when the judges beheld and examined their kings naked; ἵνα καὶ ὁ Ἀρχὼν δικαστὴς ἂν ἐκ τοῦς παλαισιέροις χρόνοις, γυμνὸν ἐθεώρει τὸν βασιλέα. Horapollinis Hierogl. lib. i. cap. 40.

† Ἦν δὲ νόμος οὗτος περὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ Κρόνου, καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐστὶν ἐν θεοῖς, τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν μὲν δικαίως τὸν βίον διελθόντα καὶ ὁσίως, ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσῃ

The matter now begins to clear up; and we see plainly, that the circumstance of the *falsely condemned* alludes to this old fable: so that by *falso damnati crimine mortis* (if it be the true reading) VIRGIL did not mean, as one would suppose, *innocentes addicti morti ob injustam calumniam*, but *homines indigne et perperam adjudicati*; not *men falsely condemned*, but *wrongfully judged*, whether to acquittal or conviction; but condemnation being oftenest the sentence of justice, the greater part is put figuratively for the whole.

He

τελευτήσῃ, εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀπιόντα, οἰκεῖν ἐν πάσῃ εὐδαιμονίᾳ ἐκτὸς κακῶν· τὸν δὲ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀθέως, εἰς τὸ τῆς τίσεώς τε καὶ δίκης δεσμωτήριον, ὁ δὲ τάρταρον καλεῖσιν, ἰέναι. Τούτων δὲ δικασταὶ ἐπὶ Κρόνου, καὶ ἔτι νεωστὶ τοῦ Διὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐχόντος, ζωντες ἦσαν ζῶντων, ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ δικάζοντες ᾗ μέλλοιεν τελευτᾶν· κακῶς ἂν αἱ δίκαι ἐκρίνοντο. Ὅτε ἓν Πλούτων καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ ἐκ μακάρων νήσων ἴοιτες, ἔλεγον πρὸς τὸν Δία, ὅτι φοιτῶσιν σφὶν ἄνθρωποι ἀναξίως ἐκαλέρωσε ἀνάξιοι, εἶπεν ἓν ὁ Ζεύς, Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ (ἔφη) παύσω τοῦτο γιγνόμενον· νῦν μὲν γὰρ κακῶς αἱ δίκαι δικάζονται. ἀμπεχόμενοι γὰρ (ἔφη) οἱ κεκριμένοι κρίνονται· ζῶντες γὰρ κρίνονται. Πολλοὶ ἓν ψυχὰς πονηρὰς ἔχοντες, ἠμφιεσμένοι εἰσὶ σώματά τε καλὰ, καὶ γένη καὶ πλούτους· καὶ ἐπειδὰν ἡ κρίσις ἦ, ἔρχονται αὐτοῖς πολλοὶ μάρτυρες, μαρτυρήσαντες ὡς δικαίως βεβιώκασιν. Οἱ ἓν δικασταὶ ὑπό τε τούτων ἐκπλήττονται, καὶ ἅμα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀμπεχόμενοι δικάζουσι, πρὸ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ὦτα καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα προκεκαλυμμένοι· ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῖς πάντα ἐπίπροσθεν γίγνεται, καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν ἀμφιέσματα, καὶ τὰ τῶν κεκριμένων. Πρῶτον μὲν ἓν (ἔφη) παυστέον ἐστὶ προειδότας αὐτοὺς τὸν θάνατον· νῦν γὰρ προΐσασι· τοῦτο μὲν ἓν καὶ δὴ εἴρηται τῷ Προμηθεῖ, ὅπως ἂν παύσῃ αὐτῶν· ἔπειτα γυμνοὺς κριτέον ἀπάντων τούτων. τεθνεῶτας γὰρ δεῖ κρίνεσθαι· καὶ τὸν κριτὴν δεῖ γυμνὸν εἶναι, τεθνεῶτα, αὐτῇ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχὴν θεωρεῖνα, ἐξαίφνης ἀποθανόντος ἑκάστου, ἔρημον πάντων τῶν συγγενῶν· καταλιπόντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πάντα ἐκεῖνον τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα δικαία ἡ κρίσις ᾖ. Ἐγὼ μὲν ἓν ταῦτα ἐγνωκὼς πρότερον ἢ ὑμεῖς, ἐποιησάμην δικαστὰς υἱεῖς ἐμαυτῷ. δύο μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, Μίνω τε καὶ Ῥαδαμάνθυν· ἕνα δὲ ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης, Αἰακόν· Οὗτοι ἓν ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσωσι, δικάσουσιν ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι, ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ, ἐξ ἧς φέρεον τὼ ὁδώ, ἡ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἡ δ' εἰς τάρταρον· καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας Ῥαδαμάνθυς κρινεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης Αἰακός. Μίνῳ δὲ προσβοηθὸν δώσω, ἐπιδιακρίνειν, ἐὰν ἄπορόν τι τῷ ἑτέρῳ, ἵνα ὡς δικαιοτάτη ἡ κρίσις ᾖ περὶ τῆς πορείας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Tom. i. p. 523. Serr. Edit.

He who thinks this too licentious a figure, will perhaps be inclined to believe, that the poet might write,

Hos juxta, falso damnati TEMPORE mortis:

which not only points up to the fable, but hints at the original of it; and besides, agrees best with the context. But as the words *tempore mortis* are only to be explained by this passage of Plato, a transcriber might be easily tempted to change them to something more intelligible.

One difficulty only remains; and that, to confess the truth, hath arisen rather from a mistake of Virgil, than of his reader. We find these people yet unjudged, already fixed, with other criminals, in the assigned district of purgatory. But they are misplaced, through an oversight of the poet; which, had he lived to perfect the Æneis, he would probably have corrected: for the fable tells us they should be stationed on the borders of the three divisions, in that part of the high road, which dividing itself in two, leads, the one to Tartarus, the other to Elysium, thus described by the poet:

Hic locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambas,
Dextera, quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit:
Hic iter Elysium nobis; at læva malorum
Exercet pœnas, & ad impia Tartara mittit.

It only remains to consider the origin or moral of the fable; which, I think, was this: it was an Egyptian custom, as we are told by *Diodorus Siculus*, for judges to sit on every man's life, at the time of his interment; to examine his past actions, and to condemn and acquit according to the evidence before them. These judges were of the priesthood; and so, it is probable, taught, like the priests of the church of Rome, that their decrees were ratified in the other world. Partiality and cor-

ruption would, in time, pervert their decrees; and spite and favour prevail over jusitce! As this might scandalize the people, it would be found necessary to teach, that the sentence which was to influence every one's final doom, was reserved for a future judicature. However, the Priest took care that all should not go out of his hands; and when he could sit no longer *Judge*, he contrived to find his account in turning *Evidence:* as may be seen by the singular cast of this ancient inscription: "Ego Sextus Anicius Pontifex "TESTOR honeste hunc vixisse: manes ejus inveniant "quietem*."

How much this whole matter needed explaining, we may see by what a fine writer makes of it, in a discourse written to illustrate Æneas's descent into hell: "There "are three kinds of persons (says he) described as "being situated on the BORDERS; and I can give no "reason for their being stationed there in so par- "ticular a manner, but because none of them seem to "have had a proper right to a place among the dead, "as not having run out the thread of their days, "and finished the term of life that had been allotted "them upon earth. The first of these are the souls "of infants, who are snatched away by untimely ends; "the second are of those who are put to death wrong- "fully and by an unjust sentence; and the third, of "those who grew weary of their lives, and laid violent "hands upon themselves †."

After this, follow the episodes of Dido and Deïpho- bus, in imitation of Homer; where we find nothing explanatory of the true nature of this episode, but the

* Fabius Celsus Inscript. Antiq. lib. iii.

† Mr. Addison's Works, vol. ii. p. 300, quarto edit. 1721.

strange description of Deïphobus; whose mangled phantom is drawn according to the philosophy of Plato; which teaches that the dead not only retain all the passions of the mind, but all the marks, and blemishes of the body*. A wild doctrine, which Lucian agreeably rallies in his *Menippus*; who is made to say, that he saw Socrates in the Shades, busied at his old trade of *Disputation:* but that his legs yet appeared swelled, from the effects of his last deadly potion †.

Æneas, having passed this first division, comes now on the confines of TARTARUS; and is instructed in what relates to the crimes and punishments of the inhabitants.

His guide here more openly declares her office of HIEROPHANT, or interpreter of the *Mysteries:*

> - - - Dux inclyte Teucrûm,
> Nulli fas casto sceleratum insistere limen:
> Sed ME *cum lucis* HECATE PRÆFECIT *avernis*,
> *Ipsa Deûm pœnas* DOCUIT, *perque omnia* DUXIT - - -

It is remarkable, that Æneas is led through the regions of Purgatory and Elysium; but he only sees the sights of Tartarus at a distance, and this could not well be otherwise in the shows of the *Mysteries*, for very obvious reasons.

* Μαγιγίας αὖ εἴτις ἦν, καὶ ἴχνη εἶχε τῶν πληγῶν ἁλὰς ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἢ ὑπὸ μαστίγων ἢ ἄλλων τραυμάτων ζῶν, καὶ τεθνεῶτος τὸ σῶμά ἐστιν ἰδεῖν ταῦτα ἔχον· καλεαγότα εἴτε ἦν μέρη, ἢ διεγραμμένα ζῶντος, καὶ τεθνεῶτος ταῦτα ἔνδηλα· ἐνὶ δὲ λόγῳ οἷος εἶναι παρεσκεύασο τὸ σῶμα ζών, ἔνδηλα ταῦτα καὶ τελειλήσαντος ἦν πάντα, ἢ τὰ πολλὰ ἐπί τινα χρόνον Georg. p. 524.

† ἔτι μέντοι ἐπεφύσητο αὐτῷ, καὶ διῳδήκει ἐκ τῆς φαρμακοποσίας τὰ σκέλη. T. I. p. 481. Edit. Reitzii, 4°, Amstel. 1743.

The

The criminals destined to eternal punishment, in this division, are,

1. Those who had *sinned so secretly as to escape the animadversion of the Magistrate:*

Gnossius hæc Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna:
Castigatque auditque dolos, SUBIGITQUE FATERI
Quæ quis apud superos, FURTO lætatus inani,
Distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem.

And it was principally on account of such crimes that the Lawgiver inforced the doctrine of a future state of punishment. But it is worth while to observe, that, according to the teaching of the *Mysteries*, the RACK TO EXTORT CONFESSION, came originally from THE PLACE OF THE DAMNED, where only it could be equitably applied.

2. Those whose principles dissolve the first bonds of association, and society, the ATHEISTS and *despisers of God and religion:*

Hic genus antiquum terræ Titania pubes.

This was agreeable to the laws of Charondas, who says: "Be the contempt of the Gods put in the "number of the most flagitious crimes*." The poet dwells particularly on that species of impiety which affects divine honours:

Vidi & crudeles dantem Salmonea pœnas,
Dum flammas Jovis & sonitus imitatur Olympi.

And this without doubt, was an oblique castigation of the APOTHEOSIS, then beginning to be paid and received at Rome.

* Ἔστω δὲ μέγιστα ἀδικήματα θεῶν καταφρόνησις. Apud Stobæi Serm. xlii. p. 290. lin. 34. Tiguri, fol. 1559.

3. The

3. The *infringers of the duties of* IMPERFECT *obligation, which civil laws cannot reach:* such as those without natural affection to brothers, duty to parents, protection to clients, or charity to the poor:

Hic quibus invisi fratres, dum vita manebat;
Pulsatusve parens; & fraus innexa clienti *;
Aut qui divitiis soli incubuere repertis,
Nec partem posuere suis; quæ maxima turba est.

4. Those pests of public and private peace, the TRAYTOR and the ADULTERER; with all their various spawn, of *perjury* and *incest:*

Quique ob adulterium cæsi, quique arma secuti
Impia, nec veriti dominorum fallere dextras —
Vendidit hic auro patriam, dominumque potentem
Imposuit; fixit leges pretio, atque refixit.
Hic thalamum invasit natæ, vetitosque hymenæos.

It is observable, he does not say, simply, *adulteri*, but *ob adulterium cæsi*; as implying, that the greatest civil punishment pleads for no mitigation of this crime at the bar of divine justice.

5. The INVADERS AND VIOLATERS OF THE HOLY MYSTERIES, held out in the person of Theseus, make the fifth and last class of offenders:

- - - - Sedet, æternumque sedebit
Infelix Theseus; Phlegyasque † miserrimus omnes

* So the law of the Twelve Tables: PATRONUS SI CLIENTI FRAUDEM FECERIT, SACER ESTO.

† The Phlegyæ here mentioned, I take to be those people of Bœotia spoken of by Pausanias, who attempting to plunder the temple of Apollo at Delphi, were destroyed by lightning, earthquakes, and pestilence; hence Phlegyæ, I suppose, signified impious, sacrilegious persons in general; and is so to be understood in this place.

Admonet,

Admonet, & magna testatur voce per umbras:
DISCITE JUSTITIAM MONITI, ET NON TEMNERE DIVOS.

The fable says, that Theseus and his friend Pirithous formed a design to steal Proserpine from hell; but being taken in the fact, Pirithous was thrown to the dog Cerberus, and Theseus kept in chains*, till he was delivered by Hercules: which without doubt means the death of one, and the imprisonment of the other, for their clandestine intrûsion into the *Mysteries*. We have already offered several reasons, to shew that the descent of Theseus into hell, was a *violation of the Mysteries:* to which we may add what the ancients tell us of the duration of his imprisonment, which was four years; the interim between the celebrations of the greater *Mysteries*. So Seneca the tragedian makes him say:

Tandem profugi noctis æternæ plagam,
Vastoque manes carcere umbrantem polum.
Ut vix cupitum sufferunt oculi diem!
Jam QUARTA *Eleusis* dona Triptolemi secat,
Paremque toties Libra composuit diem;
Ambiguus ut me sortis ignaræ labor
Detinuit inter mortis & vitæ mala †.

This may reconcile the contradictory accounts of the fable concerning Theseus; some of which say he was delivered from hell; others, that he was eternally detained there. The *first* relates to the liberty given him by the president of the *Mysteries* at the ensuing

* Καλασχεθέντων δὲ αὐτῶν, Πειρίθοῦ μὲν ἐξεώθη
Τῷ τρικεφάλῳ τῷ κυνὶ, Θησεὺς δ' εἰρχθῆ κραλεῖται.
Jo. Tzetzes, C. ii. cap. 51.

† Hippol.

celebration:

celebration: the other, to what the *Mysteries* taught he and all would suffer in the other world for *violating* them. This leads us to a circumstance which will much confirm the general interpretation of this famous Episode. In Æneas's speech to the Sibyl, Theseus is put amongst those heroes who went to, and returned from, hell:

- - - - Quid Thesea magnum,
Quid memorem Alciden? - - -

But in the place before us he is represented as confined there eternally. Julius Hyginus, in his *Commentaries on Virgil* *, thinks this a gross contradiction; which Virgil would have corrected, had he lived to finish the poem. But can it be supposed, the poet was not aware of this, in two passages so near one another, in the same book? In truth, his employing these differing circumstances, confirms the general interpretation; and the general interpretation helps to reconcile the difference. Æneas wanted to be initiated; and when he speaks to the Sibyl, or *Mystagogue*, he enumerates those heroes who had been initiated before him; that is, such who had seen the *shows* of the *Mysteries*, of which number was Theseus, though he had intruded violently. But when Virgil comes to describe these *Shows*, which were supposed to be a true representation of what was done and suffered in Tartarus, Theseus is put among the *damned*, that being his station in the other world.

This will remind the learned reader of a story told by Livy. "The Athenians (says he) drew upon "themselves a war with Philip, on a very slight oc- "casion; and at a time when nothing remained of

* A. Gellii Noct. Att. lib. x. cap. 16.

"their

" their ancient fortune, but their high spirit. Two " young Acarnanians, during the days of INITIATION, " themselves *uninitiated*, and ignorant of all that " related to that secret worship, entered the temple " of CERES along with the crowd. Their discourse " soon betrayed them; by making some absurd en- " quiries into the meaning of what they saw: so " being brought before the President of the *Mysteries*, " although it was evident they had entered ignorantly, " and without design, they were put to death, as " guilty of a most abominable crime *."

The office Theseus is put upon, of admonishing his hearers against IMPIETY, could not, sure, be discharged in these *shows* by any one so well, as by him who represented the Violator of them. But the critics, unconscious of any such design, considered the task the poet has imposed on Theseus, of perpetually sounding in the ears of the damned, this admonition:

DISCITE JUSTITIAM MONITI, ET NON TEMNERE DIVOS,

as a very impertinent employment. For though it was a sentence of great truth and dignity, it was preached to very little purpose amongst those who were never to hope for pardon or remission.

Even the ridiculous Scarron hath not neglected to

* Contraxerant autem cum Philippo bellum Athenienses haudquaquam digna causa, dum ex vetere fortuna nihil præter animos servant. Acarnanes duo juvenes per initiorum dies, non initiati, templum Cereris, imprudentes religionis, cum cetera turba ingressi sunt. Facile eos sermo prodidit, absurde quædam percunctantes; deductique ad antistites templi cum palam esset per errorem ingressos, tanquam ob infandum scelus, interfecti sunt. Hist. lib. xxxi.

put

put it in this absurd light*; and it must be owned, that, according to the common ideas of Æneas's descent into hell, it can hardly be seen in any other.

But, suppose Virgil to be here relating the admonitory maxims delivered during the celebration of these MYSTIC SHOWS, and nothing could be more just or useful: for then the discourse was addressed to the *vast multitude of living spectators*. Nor is it a mere supposition that such discourses made part of these representations. Aristides expressly says†, that in no place were more astonishing words pronounced, or sung, than in these *Mysteries*. The reason, he tells us, was, that the *sounds* and the *sights* might mutually assist each other in making an impression on the minds of the Initiated. But, from a passage in Pindar, I conclude, that in these shows (from whence men took their ideas of the infernal regions) it was customary for each offender, as he passed by, in machinery, to make an admonition against his own crime. "It is reported (says Pindar) that Ixion, by "the decrees of the Gods, while he is incessantly "turning round his rapid wheel, calls out upon "MORTALS to this effect, That they should be always "at hand to repay a benefactor for the services he "had done them‡." Where the word BPOTOI,

* Cette sentence est bonne & belle,
Mais en Enfer de quoi sert-elle?

† Τίνι δ' ἄλλῳ χωρίων, ἢ μύθων φῆμαι θαυμαστότερα ἐφύμνησαν, ἢ τὰ δρώμενα μείζω ἔσχε τὴν ἔκπληξιν, ἢ μᾶλλον εἰς ἐφαμίλλιον καλέση ταῖς ἀκοαῖς τὰ ὁρώμενα; Eleus.

‡ Θεῶν δ' ἐφέλμαῖσιν
Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ταῦτα
Βροτοῖς λέγειν, ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῷ
Παντὰ κυλινδόμενον.
Τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς ἀμοιβαῖς
Ἐπιχομένους τίνεσθαι. 2 Pyth.

living

living men, seems plainly to shew that the speech was at first made before men in this world.

The poet closes his catalogue of the damned with these words:

Ausi omnes immane nefas, AUSOQUE POTITI.

For the antients thought that an action was sanctified by the success; which they esteemed a mark of the favour and approbation of the Gods:

Victrix Causa Diis PLACUIT, sed victa Catoni.

As this was a very pernicious doctrine, it was necessary to teach, that the imperial villain who trampled on his country, and the baffled plotter who expired on a gibbet, were equally the objects of divine vengeance.

Æneas has now passed *Tartarus*; and here end the LESSER MYSTERIES. Their original explains why this sort of *shows* was exhibited in them. We are told, they were instituted for the sake of Hercules, when about to perform his eleventh labour, of fetching Cerberus from hell *, and were under the presidency of *Proserpine* †.

The Hero advances to the borders of ELYSIUM, and here he undergoes the *lustration:*

Occupat Æneas aditum, *corpusque recenti*
Spargit aqua, ramumque adverso in limine figit.

" Being now about to undergo the lustrations (says

* οἱ Ἐλευσίνιοι ἐπ' αὐτῷ τὰ μικρὰ ἐποιήσαντο μυστήρια——Ἐμυήθη ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τὰ δι' αὐτὸν [Ἡρακλέα] λεγόμενα ΜΙΚΡΑ μυστήρια. Tzetz. in Lycoph.

† τὰ δὲ μικρὰ Περσεφόνης——Schol. Aristoph. ad Plut. secund.

" Sopater)

" Sopater) which immediately precede initiation into " the *greater Mysteries*, they called me happy *."

Accordingly, Æneas now enters on the GREATER MYSTERIES, and comes to the abodes of the blessed:

Devenere locos lætos, & amœna vireta
Fortunatorum nemorum, sedesque beatas:
Largior hic campos æther, & lumine vestit
Purpureo: solemque suum, sua sidera norunt.

These two so different scenes of Tartarus and Elysium explain what Aristides meant, when he called the shows of *Eleusinian Mysteries, that most shocking, and, at the same time, most ravishing representation* †.

The Initiated, who till now only bore the name of Μύσαι, are called ΕΠΟΠΤΑΙ, and this new vision ΑΥΤΟΨΙΑ. " The Αὐτοψία or the seeing with their " own eyes (says Psellus) is when he who is initiated " beholds the divine lights ‡."

In these very circumstances Themistius describes the Initiated, when just entered upon this scene. " It " being thoroughly purified, he now discloses to the " Initiated, a region § all over illuminated, and shin-

" ing

* Μέλλων δὲ τοῖς καθαρσίοις, τοῖς πρὸ τῆς τελείης, ἐνευχάνειν, ἐκάλεν εὐδαίμονα ἐμαυτὸν. In Divis. Quæst.

† τῆτον φρικαλέταλόν τε καὶ φαιδρόταλον. Eleus.

‡ Αὐτοψία ἐστὶν, ὅταν αὐτὸς ὁ τελέμενος τὰ θεῖα φῶτα ὁρᾷ. In Schol. in Orac. Zoroast.

§ This which was *all over illuminated*, and which the priest had *thoroughly purified*, was ἄγαλμα, an image. The reason of transferring what is said of the illumination of the *image*, to the illumination of the region, is, because this image represented the appearances of the divine Being, in one large, uniform, extensive light. Thus Jamblichus De mysteriis: Μέλλε δὴ ταῦτα τῶν αὐτοφανῶν ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΩΝ λόγες ἀφορισόμεθα· ἐκεῖν ἐν μὲν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν

ΑΥΤΟΨΙΑΙΣ,

" ing with a divine splendor. The cloud and thick " darkness are dispersed*; and the mind emerges, " as it were, into day, full of light and chearfulness; " as before, of disconsolate obscurity †."

Let

ΑΥΤΟΨΙΑΙΣ, ἐνεργέστερα καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας ὁρᾶται τὰ θεάματα, ἀκριβῶς τε διαλάμπει, καὶ διηρθρωμένα λαμπρῶς ἐκφαίνεται.—And again, Ὡσαύτως τοίνυν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ΦΩΤΟΣ· τὰ μὲν τῶν θεῶν ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΑ φωλὸς πλέον ἀσράπτει—τὸ μὲν τῶν θεῶν πῦρ, ἄτομον, ἀφθεγκτὸν ἐκλάμπει· καὶ πληροῖ τὰ ὅλα βάθη τῆ κόσμου πυρίως, αλλ' ὁ περικοσμίως. §. ii. cap. 4. He says, too, that it was *without figure*, ψυχῆς δὲ τῆς μὲν ὅλης, καὶ ἐν ἑδενὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος εἴδει καλεχομένης πῦρ ὁρᾶται ἀνείδεον—cap. 7. To this image, the following lines in the Oracles of Zoroaster allude:

Μὴ φύσεως καλέσης ΑΥΤΟΠΤΟΝ ΑΓΑΛΜΑ,
Οὐ γὰρ χρὴ κείνες σε βλέπειν πρὶν σῶμα ΤΕΛΕΣΘΗι.

" Invoke not the self-conspicuous image of nature, for thou must " not behold these things before thy body be purified by initiation." This αὐτοπτον ἄγαλμα was only a diffusive shining light, as the name partly declares, thus described presently after, in the same Oracles:

Ἡνίκα βλέψῃς μορφῆς ἄτερ εὐίερον πῦρ,
Λαμπόμενον σκιρτηδὸν ὅλῃ κατὰ βένθεα κόσμῃ,
Κλῦθι πυρὸς φωνήν.

And the *sight* of this divine splendor was what the Mysteries called, ΑΥΤΟΨΙΑ.

* Pletho tells us with what these clouds were accompanied, viz. thunder and lightning, and other meteoric appearances. Τὰ δὲ τελεμένοις φαινόμενα, κεραυνοὶ, καὶ πῦρ, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο, σύμβολα ἄλλως ἐσὶν, ὁ θεῖ τίς φυσις. In Schol. ad Orac. Mag. Zor. He says they were symbols, but not of the nature of the deity: and this was true; for the symbol of this Nature was the αὐτοπτον ἄγαλμα which followed. Hence, as we see above, it was *without figure*.

† — ἀποσμήξας παλαχόθεν, ἐπεδείκνυ τῷ μυθμένῳ μαρμαρύσσον τε ἦδη, καὶ αὐγῇ καλαλαμπόμενον θεσπεσίᾳ, ἥτε ὁμίχλη ἐκείνη, καὶ τὸ νέφος ἀθρόον ὑπερρήγνυλο· καὶ ἐξεφαίνελο ὁ νεὼς ἐκ τῆ βάθους, φέγγεος ἀνάπλεως καὶ ἀγλαΐας ἀπὶ τῆ πρότερον σκότου. Orat. in Patrem.

Let me observe, that the lines,

Largior hic campos æther, & lumine vestit
Purpureo: SOLEMque suum, sua sidera norunt,

are in the very language of those, who profess to tell us what they saw at their *initiation into the greater Mysteries.* "Nocte media vidi SOLEM *candido* co-"ruscantem lumine *," says Apuleius on that occasion: for *candido* and *purpureo lumine* signify the very same thing.

Here Virgil, by leaving his Master, and copying the amiable paintings of Elysium as they were represented in the *Mysteries*, hath artfully avoided a fault, too justly objected to Homer, of giving so dark and joyless a landscape of the *fortunata nemora*, as could raise no desire or appetite for them: his favourite Hero himself, who inhabited them, telling Ulysses, that he had rather be a day-labourer above, than command in the regions of the dead. Such a representation defeats the very intent of the Lawgiver, in propagating the doctrine of a future state. Nay, to mortify every excitement to noble actions, the Greek poet makes reputation, fame, and glory, the great spur to virtue in the pagan system, to be visionary and impertinent. On the contrary, Virgil, whose aim, in this poem, was the service of Society, makes the love of glory so strong a passion in the other world, that the Sibyl's promise to Palinurus, that his NAME should be affixed to a promontory, rejoices his shade even in the regions of the unhappy:

Æternumque locus Palinuri *nomen* habebit:
His dictis curæ emotæ, pulsusque parumper
Corde dolor tristi; GAUDET COGNOMINE TERRA.

* Met. lib. xi.

They

They were the licentious stories of the Gods, and this ungracious description of Elysium (both so pernicious to society) which made Plato drive Homer out of his Republic.

But to return. The poet having described the climate of the happy regions, speaks next of the amusements of its inhabitants:

Pars in gramineis exercent membra palæstris;
Contendunt ludo, & fulva luctantur arena.

Besides the obvious allusion, in these lines, to the philosophy of Plato, concerning the duration of the passions, it seems to have a more secret one to what he had all the way in his eye, the *Eleusinian Mysteries*; whose celebration was accompanied with the GRECIAN GAMES *. On which account too, perhaps, it was that, in the disposition of his work, his fifth book is employed in the *Games* as a prelude to the *Descent* in the sixth.

1. The first place, in these happy regions, is assigned to LEGISLATORS, *and the founders of Society, who brought men from a savage, to a civil life.*

Magnanimi Heroës, nati melioribus annis.

At the head of these is Orpheus, the most renowned of the European Lawgivers; but better known under the character of Poet: for the first laws being written in measure, to allure men to learn them, and, when learnt, to retain them, the fable would have it, that

* Ἐνδοξόταλοι πάντων οἱ καλὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀγῶνες· καὶ μὴν τέτων πρεσβύταλος ὁ τῶν Παναθηναίων· εἰ δὲ βέλει, ὁ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων. Aristides Panath. — Μυηθῆναι δὲ ξένων πρώτης Ἡρακλέα, καὶ Διοσκόρες· ἀγῶνά τε γυμνικὸν γενέσθαι πρῶτον Ἐλευσῖνι τῆς Ἀτλικῆς. Idem. Eleusin.

by the force of harmony, he softened the savage inhabitants of Thrace:

- - - Threïcius longa cum veste sacerdos
Obloquitur numeris septem discrimina vocum.

But he has the first place; because he was not only a Legislator, but the Introducer of the *Mysteries* into that part of Europe.

2. The next is allotted to PATRIOTS, *and those who died for the service of their country:*

Hic manus, ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi.

3. The third to *virtuous and pious* PRIESTS:

Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat:
Quique pii vates & Phœbo digna locuti.

For it was of principal use to Society, that religious men should lead holy lives; and that they should teach nothing of the Gods but what was agreeable to the divine nature.

4. The last place is given to the INVENTORS OF ARTS *mechanical and liberal:*

Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes:
Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo.

The order is exact and beautiful. The first class is of those who FOUNDED Society, heroes and lawgivers: the second, of those who SUPPORTED it, patriots and holy priests: and the third, of those who ADORNED it, the inventors of the arts of life, and the recorders of worthy actions.

Virgil has all along closely followed the doctrine of the *Mysteries*, which carefully taught that virtue only could entitle men to happiness; and that rites, ceremonies,

monies, lustrations, and sacrifices would not supply the want of it.

Nor has he been less studious in copying their *shows* and *representations*; in which the figures of those heroes and heroines, who were most celebrated in the writings of the ancient Greeks, passed in procession *.

But, notwithstanding this entire conformity between the poet's scenes and those represented in the *Mysteries*, something is still wanting to complete the proofs: and that is, the famous SECRET of the *Mysteries*, THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD, of which so much hath been said above. Had Virgil neglected to give us this characteristic mark, though, even then, we could not but say, his intention was *to represent an Initiation*; yet we must have been forced to own he had done it but imperfectly. But he was too good a painter, to leave any thing ambiguous; and hath therefore concluded his hero's *Initiation*, as was the custom, with instructing him in the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, or the doctrine of the UNITY. Till this was done, the *Initiated* was not arrived to the highest stage of perfection; nor, in the fullest sense, intitled to the appellation of ΕΠΟΠΤΗΣ.

Musæus, therefore, who had been *Hierophant* at Athens, takes the place of the Sibyl (as it was the custom to have different Guides in different parts of the celebration) and is made to conduct him to the recess, where his Father's shade opens to him *the doctrine of Truth*, in these sublime words:

Principio cœlum, ac terras, camposque liquentes,
Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque astra

* — ὅσα μὲν δὴ θέας ἐχόμενα εἶδον γενεαὶ παμπληθεῖς εὐδαιμόνων ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀῤῥήτοις φάσμασιν· ἃ δ' εἰς τὸ μέσον ποιηλαὶ, καὶ λογοποιοὶ καὶ συγγραφεῖς πάντες ὑμνέσι — Aristid.

SPIRITUS INTUS ALIT, totamque infusa per artus
MENS agitat molem, & magno se corpore miscet.
Inde hominum pecudumque genus, vitæque volantum,
Et quæ marmoreo fert monstra sub æquore pontus.

This was no other than the doctrine of the old Egyptians, as we are assured by Plato; who says they taught that Jupiter was the SPIRIT WHICH PERVADETH ALL THINGS *.

We shall shew how easily the Greek Philosophy corrupted this *principle* into (what is now called) SPINOZISM †. Here Virgil has approved his judgement to great advantage. Nothing was more abhorrent from the *Mysteries*, than Spinozism, as it overturned ‡ the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, which the *Mysteries* so carefully inculcated; and yet the principle itself, of which Spinozism was the abuse, was cherished there, as it was the consequence of the doctrine of the Unity, the grand secret of the *Mysteries*. Virgil, therefore, delivers the principle, with great caution, and pure and free of the abuse; though he understood the nature of Spinozism, and (by the following lines in his fourth *Georgic*, where he delivers it) appears to have been infected with it:

- - - - Deum namque ire per omnes
Terrasque tractusque maris, cœlumque profundum
Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum
Quemque sibi tenues nascentem arcessere vitas.
Scil. HUC REDDI DENIQUE AC RESOLUTA REFERRI
OMNIA - - -

* Ἰδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ τέτων παλαίτατα· ἦν δὲ τὰ Αἰγύπτια· τὴν Ἶσιν φασὶ, &c. — καὶ Δία μὲν, τὸ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΧΩΡΟΥΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ. In Cratylo.

† See Book iii. Sect. 4. ‡ See Book iii. Sect. 3. & 4.

But

But the *Mysteries* did not teach the doctrine of the Unity for mere speculation; but, as we said before, to obviate certain mischiefs of polytheism, and to support the belief of a Providence. Now, as a *future* state of rewards and punishments did not quite remove the objections to its inequalities here, the *Mysteries* added to it the doctrine of the METEMPSYCHOSIS, or the belief of a prior state*. And this, likewise, our poet has been careful to record. For after having revealed the great secret of the Unity, he goes on to speak of the *Metempsychosis*, or transmigration, in this manner:

Has omnes, ubi mille rotam volvere per annos,
Lethæum ad fluvium Deus evocat agmine magno
Scilicet immemores supera ut convexa revisant,
Rursus & incipiant in corpora velle reverti.

And thence takes occasion to explain the nature and use of a Popish PURGATORY, which, in his hero's passage through that region, had not been done: this affords him too an opportunity for that noble episode, the procession of the hero's posterity, which passes in review before him: And with this the scene closes. One might well allow Virgil the use of so important a digression, (considering whom it was he celebrated under the character of Æneas) though it had been foreign to the nature of the *Mysteries* he is describing. But indeed he was even here following their customs very closely. It was then, and had been for some time, the practice of the *Mysteries*, when communicated to any aspirant of distinguished quality, to exhibit to him in their *shows* and *representations*, something

* Vid. Porph. de Abst. l. iv. sect. 16. & Cic. Fragm. ex lib. de Philosophia.

ORACULAR, relating to his own fortune and affairs. Thus Himerius tells us, that Olympia, on her uprising, after the birth of Alexander, was initiated into the Samothracian *Mysteries*; Where, in the *shows*, she saw her husband Philip, at that time in Potidæa*.

In attending the hero's progress through the three estates of the dead, I have shewn, at almost every step, from some ancient writer or other, the exact conformity of his adventures to those of the Initiated in the *Mysteries*. We shall now collect these scattered lights to a point; which will, I am persuaded, throw such a lustre on this interpretation, as to make the truth of it irresistible. To this purpose, I shall have nothing to do, but to transcribe a passage from an ancient writer, preserved by Stobæus; which professes to explain the exact conformity between DEATH, or a real descent to the infernal regions, and INITIATION, where the representation of those regions was exhibited. His words are these: THE MIND IS AFFECTED AND AGITATED IN DEATH, JUST AS IT IS IN INITIATION INTO THE GRAND MYSTERIES. AND WORD ANSWERS TO WORD AS WELL AS THING TO THING: FOR ΤΕΛΕΥΤΑΝ IS TO DIE; AND ΤΕΛΕΙΣΘΑΙ, TO BE INITIATED. THE FIRST STAGE IS NOTHING BUT ERRORS AND UNCERTAINTIES; LABORIOUS WANDERINGS; A RUDE AND FEARFUL MARCH THROUGH NIGHT AND DARKNESS. AND NOW ARRIVED ON THE VERGE OF DEATH AND INITIATION, EVERY THING WEARS A DREADFUL ASPECT: IT IS ALL HORROR, TREMBLING, SWEAT-

* Λέγεταί ποτε ἡ Ὀλυμπιάδα, τὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἀλεξάνδρου τόκοις εὐδαίμονα ὀργιάζουσαν τὰ Καβείρων ἐν Σαμοθρᾴκῃ μυστήρια, ἰδεῖν καὶ τὴν τελεῖν τὸν Φίλιππον. In Eclog. Declam. apud Photium, Cod. 165. 243.

ING,

ING, AND AFFRIGHTMENT. BUT THIS SCENE ONCE OVER, A MIRACULOUS AND DIVINE LIGHT DISPLAYS ITSELF; AND SHINING PLAINS AND FLOWERY MEADOWS OPEN ON ALL HANDS BEFORE THEM. HERE THEY ARE ENTERTAINED WITH HYMNS, AND DANCES, WITH THE SUBLIME DOCTRINES OF SACRED KNOWLEDGE, AND WITH REVEREND AND HOLY VISIONS. AND NOW BECOME PERFECT AND INITIATED, THEY ARE FREE, AND NO LONGER UNDER RESTRAINTS; BUT CROWNED AND TRIUMPHANT, THEY WALK UP AND DOWN THE REGIONS OF THE BLESSED; CONVERSE WITH PURE AND HOLY MEN; AND CELEBRATE THE SACRED MYSTERIES AT PLEASURE*.

* Τὸ δὲ πάσχειν πάθ☉, οἷον οἱ τελεῖται μεγάλαις καὶεργιαζόμενοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα τῷ ῥήμαλι, καὶ τὸ ἔργον τῷ ἔργῳ τὲ τελευῖᾶν καὶ τελεῖσθαι προσέσικε, πλάναι τὰ πρῶτα καὶ περιδρομαὶ κοπώδεις, καὶ διὰ σκότες τινὸς ὕποπλοι πορεῖαι καὶ ἀτέλεσοι· εἶτα πρὸ τὲ τέλες αὐτὲ τὰ δεινὰ πάνλα, φρίκη, καὶ τρόμ☉, καὶ ἱδρὼς, καὶ θάμβ☉· ἐκ δὲ τότε, φῶς τι θαυμάσιον ἀπηνίσεν, ἢ τόποι καθαροὶ, καὶ λειμῶνες ἐδέξανλο, φωνὰς καὶ χορείας καὶ σεμνότηλας ἁγισμάτων ἱερῶν, καὶ φανλασμάτων ἁγίων ἔχονλες· ἐν αἷς ὁ πανλελὴς ἤδη καὶ μεμυημέν☉ ἐλεύθερ☉ γεγονὼς, καὶ ἄφελ☉ περιῶν ἐσεφανωμέν☉ ὀργιάζει· καὶ σύνεσιν ὁσίοις καὶ καθαροῖς ἀνδράσι. Sermo cxix. p. 605. lin. 33. Tigur, fol. 1559. The Son of Sirach, who was full of Grecian ideas, and hath embellished his admirable work of ECCLESIASTICUS, with a great deal of Gentile learning, hath plainly alluded, though in few words, to these circumstances of INITIATION, where encouraging men to seek after *wisdom*, he says: — "At first she will walk with him by CROOKED ways, and "bring FEAR and DREAD upon him, and TORMENT HIM WITH "HER DISCIPLINE, until she may TRUST his soul, and TRY him "by her laws. Then will she return the STRAIGHT way unto "him, and COMFORT him, and shew him her SECRETS."— διεγραμμένως πορεύεται μετ' αὐτῆ ἐν πρώτοις· ΦΟΒΟΝ δὲ καὶ ΔΕΙΛΙΑΝ ἐπάξει ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ ΒΑΣΑΝΙΣΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΈΝ ΠΑΙΔΙΑ ΑΥΤΗΣ, ἕως ἂ ΕΜΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗι τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτὲ· καὶ ΠΕΙΡΑΣΗ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν αὐτῆς. Καὶ πάλιν ἐπανήξει κατ' εὐθεῖαν πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ΕΥΦΡΑΝΕΙ αὐτὸν, καὶ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΕΙ αὐτῷ τὰ ΚΡΥΠΤΑ αὐτῆς. Chap. iv. ver. 17, 18.

The

The progress finished, and every thing over, Æneas and his Guide are let out again to the upper regions, through the *ivory gate* of DREAMS. A circumstance borrowed from Homer, and very happily applied to this subject; for, as Euripides elegantly expresses it,

"ΥΠΝΟΣ τὰ ΜΙΚΡΑ τῦ θανάτυ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΑ.
A DREAM is the LESSER MYSTERIES of *death*.

But, besides this of *ivory*, there was another of *horn*. Through the first issued *false* visions; and through the latter, *true*.

Sunt geminæ Somni portæ: quarum altera fertur
Cornea, qua *veris* facilis datur exitus umbris:
Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto;
Sed *falsa* ad cœlum mittunt insomnia manes.
His ubi tum natum *Anchises*, unaque Sibyllam
Prosequitur dictis, *portaque emittit eburna*.

Servius, with the rank spirit of a grammarian, who seldom finds any thing to stop at but a solecism in expression, says very readily, "Vult autem intelligi, "falsa esse omnia quæ dixit. He would have you "understand by this, that all he has been saying is "false and groundless." The following critics give the same solution. Ruæus, one of the best, may speak for them all: "Cum igitur Virgilius Æneam "eburnea porta emittit, indicat profecto, quidquid a "se de illo inferorum aditu dictum est, in fabulis esse "numerandum." This interpretation is strengthened by Virgil's being an Epicurean; and making the same conclusion in his second *Georgic*:

Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
Atque metus omnes & inexorabile fatum
Subjecit pedibus, *strepitumque Acherontis avari!*

But Virgil wrote, not for the amusement of women and children over a winter's fire, in the taste of the *Milesian fables*; but for the use of men and citizens; to instruct them in the duties of humanity and society. The purpose, therefore, of such a writer, when he treats of a FUTURE STATE, must be to make the doctrine interesting to his reader, and useful in civil life: Virgil hath done the first, by bringing his Hero to it through the most perilous atchievement; and the second, by appropriating the rewards and punishments of that state to *virtue* and to *vice* only. Now if we will believe these critics, when the poet had laboured through a whole book, and employed all his art and genius to compass this important end, he foolishly defeats his whole design with one wanton dash of his pen, which speaks to this effect: "I have laboured, "countrymen, to draw you to virtue, and to deter you "from vice, in order to make particulars and societies, "flourishing and happy. The truths inforced to this "purpose, I have endeavoured to recommend by the "example of your ancestor and founder, Æneas; of "whom (to do you the more credit) I have made an "accomplished hero; and have set him on the most "arduous and illustrious undertaking, the establish-"ment of a civil community: and to sanctify his "character, and add reverence to his laws, I have "sent him upon the errand you see here related. "But, lest the business should do you any service, or "my hero any honour, I must inform you, that all "this talk of a *future state* is a childish tale, and "Æneas's part in it, only a fairy adventure. In a "word, all that you have heard, must pass for a lenten "dream, from which you are to draw no consequences, "but that the poet was in a capricious humour, and "disposed

" disposed to laugh at your superstitions." Thus is Virgil made to speak in the interpretation of ancient and modern critics*. And this the conclusion he was pleased to give to the master-piece of all his writings.

The truth is, the difficulty can never be gotten over, but by supposing THE DESCENT TO SIGNIFY AN INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES. This will unriddle the enigma, and restore the poet to himself. And if this was Virgil's purpose, it is to be presumed, he would give some private mark to ascertain his meaning: for which no place was so proper as the conclusion. He has, therefore, with a beauty of invention worthy of himself, made this fine improvement on Homer's story of the *two gates*; and by imagining that of horn for true visions, and that of ivory for false, insinuates, by the first, the *reality* of another state; and by the second, the *shadowy* representations of it in the shows of the *Mysteries:* so that, not the things themselves, but only the pictures of them, objected to Æneas, were false; as the Scene did not lye in HELL, but in the TEMPLE OF CERES. This representation being called ΜΥΘΟΣ, κατ' ἐξοχήν. And this we propose as the true meaning of,

Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto:
Sed FALSA ad cœlum mittunt insomnia manes.

For *falsa insomnia* do not signify *lying*, but *shadowy dreams*. Thus the Roman widow, in the famous se-

* This absurdity did not escape the learned Dacier, who, in his note on porta fugiens eburna, l. iii. Od. xxvii. of Horace, says,—Mais ce qu'il y a d'etonnant, c'est que Virgile fait sortir Anchise par la porte d'yvoire, qui est celle des faux songes; par la il detruit toutes les grandes choses qu'il a dites de Rome & d'Auguste.

pulchral

pulchral inscription *, begs the Dii manes to be so indulgent to her husband's shade, that she may see him in her dreams; that is, seem to see him, as the shade of Hector was seen by Æneas,

> In somnis ecce ante oculos mœstissimus Hector
> Visus adesse mihi - - -

and this, in distinction to what the Roman Widow makes the other part of her prayer, to be *really* joined to him in the other world.

But though the visions which issued from the ivory gate were *unsubstantial*, as being only representative; yet I make no question, but the ivory gate itself was *real*. It appears, indeed, to be no other than the sumptuous door of the temple, through which the *Initiated* came out, when the *celebration* was over. This temple was of an immense bigness, as appears from the words of Apuleius: "Senex comissimus "ducit me protinus ad ipsas fores ÆDIS AMPLIS-"SIMÆ†." Strabo is more particular: "Next (says "he) is Eleusis, in which is the temple of the Eleu-"sinian Ceres, and the mystic cell built by Ictinus,

* ITA PETO VOS MANES
SANCTISSIMI
COMMENDATVM HABEATIS
MEVM CONIVGEM ET VELLITIS
HVIC INDVLGENTISSIMI ESSE
HORIS NOCTVRNIS
VT EVM VIDEAM
ET ETIAM ME FATO SVADERE
VELLIT VT ET EGO POSSIM
DULCIVS ET CELERIVS
APVD EVM PERVENIRE.

Apud Grut. p. 786.

† Metam. l. xi. p. 996. Edit. Lugd. 8vo, 1587.

"CAPABLE

" CAPABLE OF HOLDING AS LARGE A NUMBER " AS A THEATRE*." But Vitruvius's description of it is still more curious: " ELEUSINÆ Cereris & " Proserpinæ cellam IMMANI MAGNITUDINE Ictinus " Dorico more, sine exterioribus columnis *ad laxa-* " *mentum usus sacrificiorum*, pertexit. Eam autem " postea, cum Demetrius Phalereus Athenis rerum " potiretur, Philon ante templum in fronte columnis " constitutis Prostylon fecit. *Ita aucto vestibulo* " *laxamentum initiantibus operisque summam adjecit* " *autoritatem*†." And Aristides thought this the most extraordinary circumstance in the whole affair: " But the thing most wonderful and divine was, that " of all the public assemblies of Greece, this was the " only one which was contained within the walls of " one edifice‡." Here was room, we see, and so purposely contrived, for all their SHOWS and REPRESENTATIONS.

And now, having occasionally, and by parts only, said so much of these things, it will not be amiss, in conclusion, to give one general and concise idea of the whole. I suppose the substance of the celebration to be a kind of drama of the history of Ceres; as those under the patronage of the other Gods represented their History; so HERCULES and MYTHRAS, who protected the oppressed from the ravages of wild Beasts or more cruel Men, had their labours in *war* and

* Εἶτ' Ἐλευσὶν πόλις, ἐν ᾗ τὸ τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερὸν τῆς Ἐλευσινίας· καὶ ὁ μυστικὸς σηκὸς, ὃν καλλισκεύασεν. Ἰκτῖνος, ὄχλον θεάτρα δέξασθαι δυνάμενον. — lib. ix. Geog. Edit. Casaub. p. 272. lin. 30.

† De Architect. Præf. ad l. vii.

‡ Τὸ δὲ δὴ μέγιστον καὶ θειότατον, μόνην γὰρ ταύτην πανηγύρεων εἰς οἶκος συλλαβὼν εἶχε. Eleusin. Orat.

hunting

hunting dramatically held out. The Story of Ceres afforded opportunity to represent the three particulars, about which the mysteries were principally concerned. 1. *The rise and establishment of civil society.* 2. *The doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments.* 3. *The error of polytheism, and the principle of the unity.* The Goddess's legislation in Sicily and Attica (at both which places she was said to civilize the savage manners of the inhabitants) gave birth to the *first* *. Her search for her daughter Proserpine in hell, to the *second*; and her resentments against the Gods for their permission of, or connivance at, the rape, to the *third* †. My supposition, of the dramatic nature of the shows, is not made without good authority. Lucian, in his *Alexander*, where he gives a large account of the impostures of that false prophet, speaking of the *Mysteries* which he instituted, in honour of his new-found God, Glyco; says, they were celebrated (after the usual preparatory rites of torch-bearing, initiation, and public notice to the prophane to keep at a distance) by a three Days festival: "On the first day was re-"presented the labour of Latona and the Nativity "of Apollo; the nuptials of Coronis; and the birth of "Æsculapius. On the second, the appearance of "Glyco, and the generation of the god: and on the "third, the marriage of Podalirius with the mother

* Teque, Ceres & Libera, quarum SACRA — a quibus initia vitæ, atque victus, legum, morum, mansuetudinis, humanitatis exempla hominibus et civitatibus data, ac dispertita esse dicuntur. Cic. in Verr. v. c. 72. Edit. Ox. 4°. T. IV. p. 478.

† This circumstance Apollodorus informs us of. His words are these: — Μαθοῦσα δὲ παρ' ἑρμηνέων, ὅτι Πλούτων αὐτὴν ἥρπασεν, ΟΡΤΙΖΟΜΕΝΗ ΘΕΟΙΣ ΑΠΕΛΙΠΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝ· εἰκασθεῖσα δὲ γυναικὶ, ἦκεν εἰς Ἐλευσῖνα.

"of

" of Alexander*." Every thing in these rites being performed, as the turn of the learned author's relation necessarily implies, in imitation of ancient usage. But here let it be observed, that the secrets of the *Mysteries* were unfolded both by *words* and *actions:* of which Aristides, quoted above, gives the reason; "That so " the *sounds* and *sights* might mutually assist each " other in making an impression on the minds of the " *Initiated.*" The *error of polytheism* therefore was as well exposed by the *dark wanderings* in the subterraneous passages through which the Initiated began his course, as by the information received from the Hierophant: and the *unity* as strongly illustrated by the αὐτόπλον ἄγαλμα, the *self-seen image* †, the diffusive *shining light*, as by the *hymn of Orpheus* ‡, or this *speech of Anchises.*

On the whole, if I be not much deceived, the view in which I place this famous episode, not only clears up a number of difficulties, inexplicable on any other scheme; but likewise heightens and ennobles the whole poem; for now the episode is seen to be an essential part of the main subject, which is THE ERECTION OF A CIVIL POLICY and A RELIGION; custom having made *initiation into the Mysteries* a necessary preparative for that arduous undertaking.

But there is no place in this admirable Poem, even to the SHIELD OF ÆNEAS, which will not instruct us

* Λητῦς ἐγίνετο λοχεία, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος γοναὶ, καὶ Κορωνίδος γάμος, καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸς, ἐτίκτετο· ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ Γλυκῶνος ἐπιφάνεια καὶ γένεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. Τρίτῃ δέ ἡμέρᾳ, Ποδαλειρίῳ τε ἦν καὶ τῆς μελῳδὸς Ἀλεξάνδρᾳ γάμος, &c. T. II. pag. 245. Edit. Reitzii, Amstel. 1746. 4°.

† See note (§) pp. 144, 145. ‡ See pp. 45, 46.

how

how considerable a station the MYSTERIES held in public life; and how necessary they were supposed to be, to compleat the equipage of a Hero.

The ornaments on this shield represent two famous Histories of different periods, and very differently executed. The first, a loose sketch of the foundation and early fortunes of Rome; the second, a highly finished picture of the victory of Actium. These so dissimilar pieces seem to be as oddly connected; by a sudden jump unto the other world.

Hinc procul addit
Tartareas etiam sedes, alta ostia Ditis;
Et scelerum pœnas, & te, Catilina, minaci
Pendentem scopulo, Furiarumque ora trementem;
Secretosque pios; his dantem jura Catonem *.

But there is more in this disposition than appears at first sight. The several parts make an uniform and connected System. The first of the two principal parts, we have observed, is a view of the foundation and first establishment of ancient Rome. Now Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells us, that this city was in nothing more excellent, or worthy of imitation, than in the genius of its national Religion; which was so constructed, as to be always ready to render service to the State. Hence, Virgil, when he has brought us to the time in which their CIVIL establishment was perfectly secured by the slaughter and dispersion of the Gauls,

(Scutis protecti corpora longis),

goes on to the RELIGIOUS constitution:

Hic exultantes Salios, nudosque Lupercos,
Lanigerosque apices, & lapsa ancilia cœlo

* Lib. viii.

Excuderat: castæ ducebant sacra per urbem
Pilentis matres in mollibus - - -

Now Strabo observes, that the ancient pagan religion consisted of two parts, the OPEN and the SECRET *. The *open*, Virgil hath given us in the Salian and Lupercal rites. What remained was the *secret*, and this he presents to us in an oblique description of the *Mysteries*; where (as we have shewn) the scenes of a future state were exhibited to the Initiated.

Hinc procul addit
TARTAREAS etiam SEDES, alta ostia Ditis;
Et scelerum pœnas, & te, Catilina, minaci
Pendentem scopulo, Furiarumque ora trementem;
SECRETOSQUE PIOS; his dantem jura Catonem.

So that, as before, a particular INITIATION into the *Mysteries* was meant by Æneas's descent to the infernal regions; here, the general CELEBRATION of them is to be understood by this contracted view of Tartarus and Elysium.

As this meaning seems necessary to give common propriety to the description of the shield, there is reason, I think, for receiving it. And if we allow, that the MYSTERIES are here represented under the idea of the *infernal regions*, we gain a new argument in favour of the interpretation of the sixth book.

If it be asked why Cato is put, as it were, in the place of Minos; and Catiline, of Tityus: the answer will let us into another beauty. It is a fine insinuation, that these foreign rites of Eleusis deserved to be naturalized at Rome. In which he only followed the opinion of Cicero †.

* Lib. x. p. 467. C. Edit. Paris, 1620. fol. † See p. 54.

Here

Here it may not be improper to take notice of a vulgar mistake, as old at least as Servius, that Cato the censor, and not Cato of Utica, is meant in this place; as if the Court-poet would not dare to celebrate the professed enemy of the Julian house. This made the critics seek out for a Cato of a distant age, to brave Catiline in Hell; when they might have seen it could be no other than his great contemporary, who had before withstood him in Rome. The last line,

SECRETOSQUE pios; his dantem jura Catonem,

was probably a compliment to Cato in his little senate of Utica.

All this considered, we see the reason, the great artist had to call his picture, his portraiture on the shield,

- - - Clypei NON ENARRABILE textum;

an ÆNIGMATICAL picture.

And now the nature and purpose of the *sixth* book being further supported by this collateral circumstance, it will enable us to discover and explain another beauty in the *seventh*; which depending on this principle, could not be seen till it was established.

If the recommendation of the *Mysteries* was of such importance in an epic poem of this *species*; and if, at the time of writing, many of the *Mysteries* were become abominably corrupt, we can hardly believe but that the poet, after he had so largely expatiated in praise of those that were holy and useful, would take care to stigmatize such as were become notoriously profligate: because this tended equally with the other, to vindicate, what he had in view, the honour of the institution. And what strengthens this conjecture, is the similar conduct of another great writer of antiquity upon the same subject, whom we are now coming to, APULEIUS of

Madaura, whose *Metamorphosis* is written altogether in this view of *recommending the Pagan Mysteries*; in which, as we shall find, he hath been no less circumstantial in reprobating the corrupt *Mysteries* of the SYRIAN GODDESS than in extolling the pure rites of the EGYPTIAN ISIS. A conduct so much alike, that the two cases will serve mutually to support what is here said of either.

This then seemed a necessary part in the plan of Virgil's Poem. But it was no easy matter to execute it. Another allegory would have been without grace; nor was there any repose in the latter part of the action of the poem, as in the former, to admit a digression of such a length. On the other hand, to condemn all *corrupt Mysteries*, in the plain way of a judiciary sentence, did not suit the nature of his poem: nor, if it had suited, could it have been used, without hurting the uniform texture of the work: after the *pure rites* had been so covertly recommended under figures and fictions.

The poet, therefore, with admirable invention, hath contrived, in the next book, to render the most corrupt of the *Mysteries*, the secret rites of BACCHUS, very odious, by making them the instrument to traverse the designs of Providence, in the establishment of his Hero, and by putting a FURY on the office of exciting the *aspirants*, to the *celebration* of them. Amata, the mother of Lavinia, in order to violate the league and alliance between Æneas and Latinus, contrives, at the instigation of Alecto, to secrete her daughter; and to devote and consecrate her to Bacchus, in an *initiation* into one of his abominable rites:

SIMULATO numine BACCHI
Majus adorta NEFAS, majoremque orsa furorem,
Evolat,

Evolat, & *natam* frondosis montibus ABDIT*;
Quo thalamum eripiat Teucris, tedasque moretur:
Evoë, Bacche! fremens SOLUM TE VIRGINE DIGNUM*
Vociferans - - -
Fama volat: Furiisque accensas pectore *matres*,
Idem omnis simul ardor agit, nova quærere tecta
Deseruere domos - - -
Clamat: Io, matres - - -
Solvite crinales vittas, capite orgia mecum.
Talem inter sylvas, inter deserta ferarum
Reginam ALECTO STIMULIS AGIT UNDIQUE BACCHI†.

The Mysteries of Bacchus were well chosen for an example of corrupted Rites, and of the mischiefs they produced; for they were early and flagrantly corrupted. But his principal reason for this choice, I suppose, was a very extraordinary story he found in the Roman annals, of the horrors committed in that city, during the clandestine celebration of the *Bacchic rites*; which Livy has transcribed very cir-

* Livy, we have seen, in his account of these rites of Bacchus, says, "Raptos a Diis homines dici, quos machinæ illigatos ex conspectu in abditos specus abripiant."

† Lib. vii.—Plutarch describes these corrupt Mysteries, in the same manner; but adds, that they were not celebrated in honour of any of the Gods, but to prevent mischief from EVIL DEMONS, whom, by such sort of Rites, they would appease and render innocuous.—ἰοῦλὰς δὲ καὶ θυσιὰς ὥσπερ ἡμέρας ἀποφράδας καὶ σκυθρωπὰς ἐν αἷς ὠμοφαγίαι καὶ διάσπασμοὶ, νηστειαί τε καὶ κοπετοὶ, πολλαχοῦ δὲ πάλιν αἰσχρολογίαι πρὸς ἱεροῖς, μανίαι τε ἄλλαι ὀργιάζονται ῥιψαύχενι σὺν κλόιῳ, θεῶν μὲν ἀδενὶ, ΔΑΙΜΑΝΩΝ δὲ ΦΑΥΛΩΝ, ἀπόλροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ' ἂν τελεῖν μειλιχία καὶ παραμυθία.—περὶ τῶν ἐκλελοιπότων χρηστηρίων. Edit. Francof. fol. 1599. T. II. B. 417. C.

cumstantially into the thirty-ninth book of his *History*.

Nor did the poet think he had done enough in representing the *corrupt Mysteries* under these circumstances of discredit, without specifying the mischiefs they produced; nor that he had sufficiently distinguished them from the *pure*, without shewing those mischiefs to be such as the *pure* had taken care to obviate.

The next news, therefore, we hear of Amata, after her celebration of the rites of Bacchus, is her SUICIDE, and a suicide of the most ignominious kind:

Purpureos moritura manu discindit amictus,
Et nodum *informis leti* trabe nectit ab alta.

This disaster, the poet makes Jupiter charge upon Juno; who, by the ministry of Alecto, excited Amata to an *initiation*:

Terris agitare vel undis
Trojanos potuisti: infandum accendere bellum,
DEFORMARE DOMUM, & luctu miscere hymenæos.

Suicide, as we learn by Plato*, the *holy mysteries* expressly forbad and condemned. On which account our poet, in his allegorical description of what was represented in the *Eleusinian*, has placed these criminals in a state of misery:

Proxima deinde tenent mœsti loca, qui sibi lethum - - -

Thus nobly hath Virgil completed his design on the subject of the MYSTERIES. The hero of the poem is initiated into the most pure and holy of them; his

* See above, p. 127.

capital

capital Enemy, into the most impure and corrupt; and the schemes and intrigues of each party have a correspondent issue.

To conclude, the principles here assumed, in explaining this famous poetical fiction, are, I presume, such as give solidity, as well as light, to what is deduced from them; and are, perhaps, the only Principles from which any thing reasonable can be deduced in a piece of criticism of this nature. For, from what I had shewn was taught, and represented in the *Mysteries*, I infer that Æneas's DESCENT INTO HELL signifies an INITIATION; because of the exact conformity, in all circumstances, between what Virgil relates of his Hero's adventure, and what antiquity delivers concerning the SHOWS and DOCTRINES of those MYSTERIES, into which Heroes were wont to be initiated. On the contrary, had I gratuitously supposed, without any previous knowledge of what was practised in the *Mysteries*, that the *descent* was an *initiation*, merely because Augustus (who was shadowed under the person of Æneas) was initiated; and thence inferred, that the *Mysteries* did exhibit the same scenes which the Poet hath made *Hell* to exhibit to his Hero, my explanation had been as devoid of any solid inference, as of any rational principle. And yet, if authority could support so impertinent a conduct, one might have ventured on it. A celebrated writer * in a tract intitled *Reflections on the character of Iapis in Virgil*, goes altogether on this gratuitous kind of criticism. Without any previous knowledge of the life and fortunes of ANTONIUS

* Dr. Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester. [See his Epistolary Correspondence, 1783, vol. i. p. 329.]

Musa, the physician of Augustus, he supposes that Virgil meant this person by Iapis, merely because Augustus was meant by Æneas. And then, from what the poet tells us of Iapis's history, the critic concludes it must have made part of the history of Musa; and so, instead of explaining a fable by history, he would regulate history on a fable. Whereas the principles of true criticism should have directed him to inquire previously what Antiquity had left us, concerning the person of Antonius Musa: and if, on comparing what he found there, with what Virgil has delivered concerning Iapis, any strong resemblance was to be found; then, and not till then, his ingenious conjecture, that *Iapis* was *Musa*, would stand upon a reasonable bottom. It was not thus that an able critic * lately explained Virgil's noble allegory, in the beginning of the *third* Georgic; where, under the idea of a magnificent Temple, to be raised to the Divinity of Augustus; the poet promises the famous epic poem which he afterwards erected in his honour; or, as our Milton says,

" built the lofty rhime."

But had the existence of such a poem never come to our knowledge, I am persuaded, this excellent writer had never troubled the world with so slender a conjecture that a Temple signified an epic poem; and therefore that Virgil executed, or at least intended, such a work. In truth, Critics should proceed in these inquiries about their author's secret meaning, with the same caution and sobriety which Courts of Justice employ in the detection of concealed criminals;

* See Hor. Ep. ad Augustum, with an English Commentary, and Notes, p. 36.

who

who take care, in the first place to be well assured of the *corpus delicti*, before they venture to charge the fact upon any one.

Thus far concerning the *use* of the MYSTERIES to SOCIETY. How *essential* they were esteemed to RELIGION, we may understand by the METAMORPHOSIS OF APULEIUS; a book, indeed, which from its very first appearance hath passed for a trivial fable. Capitolinus, in the life of Clodius Albinus, where he speaks of that kind of tales which disconcert the gravity of philosophers, tells us that Severus could not bear with patience the honours the Senate had conferred on Albinus; especially their distinguishing him with the title of *learned*, who was grown old in the study of old wives fables, such as the Milesian-Punic tales of his countryman and favourite, Apuleius: "Major "fuit" (says Severus, in his letter to the senate on this occasion) "dolor quod illum pro *literato* laudan- "dum plerique duxistis, quum ille næniis quibusdam "anilibus occupatus *inter Milesias Punicas Apuleii* "*sui* et ludicra literaria consenesceret." That poor, modern-spirited critic Macrobius, talks too of Apuleius in the same strain——"Nec omnibus fabulis Philo- "sophia repugnat, nec omnibus acquiescit—Fabulæ, "aut tantum conciliandæ auribus voluptatis aut ad- "hortationis quoque in bonam frugem gratia repertæ "sunt, auditum mulcent; velut comœdiæ; quales "Menander ejusve imitatores agendas dederunt: vel "argumenta fictis casibus amatorum referta; quibus "vel multum se *Arbiter* exercuit, vel APULEIUM "nonnunquam *lusisse* MIRAMUR. Hoc totum fabu- "larum genus, *quod solas aurium delicias profitetur*, "*e sacrario suo in nutricum cunas sapientiæ tractatus* "*eliminat*."

" *eliminat* *."—However he seems to wonder that Apuleius should trifle so egregiously: and well he might. For the writer of the *Metamorphosis* was one of the gravest and most virtuous, as well as most learned, philosophers of his age. But Albinus appears to have gone further into the true character of this work, than his rival Severus. And if we may believe Marcus Aurelius, who calls Albinus " homo " exercitatus, vita tristis, gravis moribus †," he was not a man to be taken with such trifling amusements as Milesian fables. His fondness therefore for the *Metamorphosis* of Apuleius shews, that he considered it in another light. And who so likely to be let into the author's true design, as Albinus, who lived very near his time, and was of Adrumetum in the neighbourhood of Carthage, where Apuleius sojourned and studied, and was honoured with public marks of distinction! The work is indeed of a different character from what some Ancients have represented it; and even from what modern Critics have pretended to discover of it. Those Ancients, who stuck in the outside, considered it, without refinement, as an idle fable: the Moderns, who could not reconcile a work of that nature to the gravity of the author's character, have supposed it a thing of more importance, and no less than a general satire on the vices of those times: " Tota porro hæc metamorphosis Apuleiana " (says Mr. Fleuri ‡) & stylo & sententia, satyricon " est perpetuum, ut recte observavit Barthius, Ad- " vers. lib. ii. cap. 11. in quo magica deliria, sacrifi- " culorum scelera, adulterorum crimina, furum &

* Lib. i. c. 2.

† Capitolinus, in Claud. Alb.

‡ Ed. Ap. in us. Delph.

" latronum

" latronum impunitæ factiones palam differuntur." But this is far short of the matter. The author's main purpose was not to satirize the specific *vices of his age* (though, to enliven his fable, and for the better carrying on his story, he hath employed many circumstances of this kind) but to recommend PAGAN RELIGION as the only cure for *all vice whatsoever*.

To give what we have to say its proper force, we must consider the real character of the writer. Apuleius, of Madaura in Afric, was a devoted Platonist; and, like the Platonists of that age, an inveterate enemy to Christianity. His zeal for the *honour of philosophy* is seen in that solemn affirmation, when convened before a court of justice, " Philosophiæ honorem qui mihi " salute mea antiquior est, nusquam minui *." His superstitious attachment to the *Religion of his country*, is seen in his immoderate fondness for the MYSTERIES. He was initiated, as himself tells us, into almost all of them: and, in some, bore the most distinguished offices. In his Apology before the proconsul of Africa, he says, " Vin' dicam, cujusmodi illas res in " sudario obvolutas, laribus Pontiani commendarim? " Mos tibi geretur. *Sacrorum pleraque Initia in* " *Græcia participavi.* Eorum quædam signa & mo- " numenta tradita mihi a sacerdotibus sedulo conservo. " Nihil insolitum, nihil incognitum dico: vel unius " Liberi Patris Symmistæ, qui adestis, scitis, quid " domi conditum celetis, & absque omnibus profanis " tacite veneremini. *At ego, ut dixi, multijuga sacra* " *et plurimos ritus, varias ceremonias,* STUDIO VERI " *et officio erga Deos, didici.* Nec hoc ad tempus " compono: sed abhinc ferme triennium est, cum

* Apologia, p. 114. Ed. Pricæi, Par. 1635. 4to. in fine.

" primis

" primis diebus quibus OEam veneram, publice *dis-*
" *serens de* ÆSCULAPII MAJESTATE eadem ista præ
" me tuli, & quot sacra nossem percensui. Ea
" disputatio celebratissima est; vulgo legitur; in om-
" nium manibus versatur; non tam facundia mea,
" quam mentione Æsculapii religiosis OEensibus
" commendata. —— Etiamne cuiquam mirum videri
" potest, cui sit ulla memoria religionis, *hominem tot*
" *Mysteriis Deûm conscium* quædam sacrorum ere-
" pundia domi adservare*?" His attachment to the *open* worship of Paganism was not inferior to that of the *secret*, as appears by what follows from the same Apology:—" Morem mihi habeo, quoquò eam, simulacrum
" alicujus Dei inter libellos conditum gestare: eique
" diebus festis thure & mero & aliquando victimis
" supplicare†." His great devotion to Paganism, therefore, must needs have been attended with an equal aversion to Christianity; and it is more than probable, that the oration he speaks of as made in honour of Æsculapius, was in the number of those INVECTIVES, at that time so well received by the enemies of our holy faith. For, not to insist on the success of his oration, which, he tells us, was in every body's hands, a thing common to discourses on subjects that engage the public attention, but rarely the fortune of such stale ware as panegyrics on a God long worn into an establishment; not, I say, to insist upon this, we may observe that Æsculapius was one of those ancient heroes‡, who were employed, by the defenders of

* Apologia, pp. 63—4. † Ibid. p. 72. lin. 5.

‡ Justin Martyr. Apol. 2. —— ὅτε δὲ πάλιν ἔμαθον προφητευθέντα θεραπεύσειν αὐτὸν νόσον, καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγερεῖν, τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν παρήνεγκαν. —— See Cyrill. cont. Julian. l. vi.

Paganism,

Paganism, to oppose to JESUS; and the circumstances of Æsculapius's story made him the fittest of any in fabulous antiquity, for that purpose. Ovid, who lived before these times of danger to the pagan Gods, and indeed, before the coming of that Deliverer who gave occasion to so many impious comparisons, hath yet made Ochirröe, in contemplation of his future actions, prophesy of him in such strains as presented to his excellent Translator the image of the *true physician of mankind*; and thereby enabled him to give a sublime to his version, which is not borrowed from his original:

Ergo ubi vaticinos concepit mente furores,
Incaluitque Deo, quem clausum pectore habebat;
Aspicit infantem, totique salutifer orbi
Cresce puer, dixit: tibi se mortalia sæpe
Corpora debebunt: animas tibi reddere ademptas
Fas erit. Idque semel, dîs indignantibus, ausus,
Posse dare hoc iterum flamma prohibebere avitâ:
Eque deo corpus fies exsangue; deusque,
Qui modò corpus eras, & bis tua fata novabis.

OVID.

Once as the sacred infant she survey'd,
The God was kindled in the raving maid,
And thus she utter'd her prophetic tale:
" Hail, great physician of the world, all hail;
" Hail, mighty Infant, who in years to come,
" Shalt heal the nations and defraud the tomb;
" Swift be thy growth, thy triumphs unconfin'd
" Make kingdoms thicker, and increase mankind.
" Thy daring art shall animate the dead,
" And draw the thunder on thy guilty head:
" Then shalt thou die.——But from the dark abode
" Rise up victorious, and be twice a God."

ADDISON.

But

But the Reformers of Paganism having lately resolved all the Popular Gods into the Attributes and Manifestations of the FIRST CAUSE, Æsculapius bore a very distinguished rank in this new Model. Pausanias tells us, that in Phocis there was a celebrated Temple dedicated to him, where he was worshipped as *the Author and original of all things**.

Having seen what there was in the common passion of his Sect, and in his own fond mode of superstition, to indispose Apuleius to *Christianity*; let us inquire what private provocation he might have to prejudice him against it; for, a private provocation, I am persuaded, he had; occasioned by a personal injury done him by one of THIS PROFESSION; which, I suppose, did not a little contribute to exasperate his bigotry. He had married a rich widow, against the good liking of her first husband's Relations; who endeavoured to set aside the marriage on pretence of his employing sorcery and enchantments to engage her affections. Of this, he was judicially accused by his wife's brother-in-law, Licinius Æmilianus, before the Procunsul of Africa. Now his Accuser, if I am not much mistaken, was a CHRISTIAN, though this interesting circumstance hath escaped the notice of his commentators. However, let us hear the character Apuleius himself gives of his Party.— "Atqui ego scio nonnullos, et cum primis *Æmilianum* istum, *facetiæ* sibi habere *res divinas deridere*. Nam, ut audio, percensentibus iis qui istum novere, NULLI DEO *ad hoc ævi supplicavit*; *nullum templum frequentavit*. Si fanum aliquod

* Σταδίοις δὲ ἀπωτέρω Τιθορέας ἑβδομήκοντα ναός ἐστιν Ἀσκληπιοῦ, καλεῖται δὲ Ἀρχαγέτας. Τιμὰς δὲ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ἔχει Τιθορέων, καὶ ἐπέρης παρὰ Φωκέων τῶν ἄλλων. Lib. x. c. xxxii. pag. 879. Edit. Kuhnii, fol. Lips. 1696.

prætereat,

prætereat, NEFAS HABET ADORANDI GRATIA MANUM LABRIS ADMOVERE. Iste vero nec diis rurationis, qui eum pascunt ac vestiunt, segetis ullas aut vitis aut gregis primitias impartit; nullum in villa ejus delubrum situm, nec locus aut lucus consecratus. At quid ego de luco aut delubro loquor? *Negant vidisse se, qui fuere, unum saltem in finibus ejus aut lapidem unctum, aut ramum coronatum.* Igitur agnomenta ei duo indita: *Charon,* ob oris et animi *diritatem:* sed alterum, quod LIBENTIUS AUDIT, ob deorum contemptum, *Mezentius**." And now let us see how this agrees with what Arnobius tells us, the Pagans objected to his Sect — "In hac enim consuestis parte crimen nobis maximum *impietatis* affigere, quod neque *ædes sacras venerationis* ad Officia construamus, *nec Deorum alicujus simulacrum* constituamus, aut formam: non *altaria fabricemus*, non aras, non cæsorum sanguinem animantium demus, *non tura, non frugas salsas*, non denique vinum liquens paterarum effusionibus inferamus. Quæ quidem nos cessamus non ideo vel exædificare, vel facere *tanquam impias geramus & scelerosas mentes, aut aliquem sumpserimus temeraria in Deos desperatione* CONTEMPTUM: sed quod, &c. †" Again, where Apuleius apostrophises his adversary in another place, he says, agreeably to the Character before given of him —— SI QUID CREDIS, Æmiliane ‡! and again, after explaining a spiritual doctrine of Plato, he adds with a sneer —— attamen si audire VERUM velis, Æmeliane §! But the repetition of this characteristic word with an ironical emphasis in his constant formula when he addresses Æmilianus, longe a VERO

* Apol. p. 64, 5. † Arnob. adver. Gentes. L. vii. sub init.

‡ P. 26. § P. 14.

aberrasse

aberrasse necesse habeat confiteri* —— Immo si VERUM velis† —— plane quidem si VERUM velis‡. 1. Now, irreligion and atheism, we know, were the names Christianity at that time went by, for having dared to renounce the whole family of the gentile Gods together. To this opprobrium, Origen alludes, when he retorts it on Polytheism, in this elegant manner— εἰ περὶ ἀγαλμάτων καὶ τῆς ΑΘΕΟΤΟ πολυθεότητος. Æmilianus we see had made such clear work, that there was not so much as an *anointed stone*, or a *tree adorned with consecrated garlands*, to be found throughout his whole Farm. That the Atheism of Æmilianus was of this sort, and no *courtly* or *philosophic* impiety, appears from his Character and Station. He was neither a fine Gentleman, nor a profound Inquirer into nature; characters indeed which are sometimes found to be above Religion; but a mere Rustic, in his life and manners. Now plain, unpolished men, in such a condition of life, are never without some Religion or other: When therefore, we find Æmilianus not of the *established*, we must needs conclude him to be a *Sectary* and a CHRISTIAN. 2. His neglect of his country Gods was not a mere negative affront of forgetfulness. He gloried in being their despiser; and took kindly to the name of MEZENTIUS, as a title of honour —— *alterum, quod libentius audit, ob deorum contemptum, Mezentius*, which I would consider as a further mark of a *Christian, convict.* 3. He even held it an *abomination* so much as to put his hand to his lips, (according to the mode of adoration in those times) when he passed by an Heathen Temple; nefas habet, adorandi gratia, manum labris admovere, the most characteristic mark of a *primitive Confessor*, by which

* P. 77. † P. 98. ‡ P. 108.

he

he could never be mistaken; nor, one would think, so long overlooked *. 4. By the frequent and sarcastical repetition of the word *verum*, Apuleius seems to sneer at that general title which the Faithful gave their *Religion*, of THE TRUTH.

Æmilianus, it seems, had misrepresented a little image of *Mercury*, which Apuleius used to carry about with him, as a *squalid magical* figure. On which occasion the Accused, in great rage, deprecates his Accuser——"At tibi, Æmiliane, pro isto mendacio, duat Deus iste, Superum & Inferum commeator utrorumque Deorum malam gratiam, semperque obvias species mortuorum, quidquid Umbrarum est usquam, quidquid Lemurum, quidquid Manium, quidquid Larvarum, oculis tuis oggerat: *Omnia noctium occursacula, omnia Bustorum formidamina, omnia sepulcrorum terriculamenta.*"—This was the common curse and supposed to be the common punishment of impiety and *Atheism*. But it has here a peculiar elegance as denounced against Æmilianus. The Busta, or Repository of dead bodies, so abhorred by the Pagans, were the very places in which the Christians assembled for nocturnal Worship.

The aversion, therefore, which Apuleius had contracted to his Christian accuser, (and we see, by what is here said, it was in no ordinary degree) would without doubt increase his prejudice to that Religion. I am persuaded he gave the Character of the Baker's wife, in his *Golden Ass*, for no other reason than to outrage our holy faith. Having drawn her stained with all the vices that could deform a Woman; to finish all, he makes her a Christian.——"Nec enim

* See note [EE] at the end of this Book.

" vel unum vitium nequissimæ illi feminæ deerat: " sed omnia prorsus, ut in quandam cœnosam latrinam, " in ejus animam flagitia confluxerant, sæva, viriosa, " ebriosa, pervicax, in rapinis turpibus avara, in sumptibus fœdis profusa: inimica fidei, hostis pudicitiæ. " *Tunc spretis atque calcatis divinis numinibus*, IN " VICEM CERTÆ RELIGIONIS MENTITA SACRILEGA " PRÆSUMPTIONE DEI, QUEM PRÆDICARET UNICUM, " CONFICTIS OBSERVATIONIBUS, VACUIS, fallens " omnes homines," &c *. So again in the fourth book, describing certain magnific Shows exhibited to the people by one Demochares; when he comes to speak of the criminals thrown to wild-beasts, he expresses himself in this manner:——Alibi noxii, PERDITA SECURITATE, suis epulis bestiarum saginas instruentes [p. 72.] The Oxf. MS. for *securitate* reads *severitate:* on which *Price* observes, *ego nec hoc nec illud intellectum habeo.* Apuleius by *noxii* apparently meant the *condemned Christians*; and *perdita securitate*, which is the true reading, censures either their reasonable hope of a happy immortality, or their false confidence that the beasts would not hurt them.

Let us see now how this would influence his writings. There was nothing the PHILOSOPHERS of that time had more at heart, especially the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans*, than the support of sinking Paganism. This service, as hath been occasionally remarked, they performed in various ways and manners: some by *allegorizing their Theology*; some by *spiritualizing their Philosophy*; and some, as Jamblicus and Philostratus, by writing the *lives of their Heroes*, to oppose to that of CHRIST; others again, as Porphyry, with this view *collected their oracles*; or as Melan-

* Met. l. ix. p. 186. Ed. Pricæi.

thius,

thius, Menander, Hicesius, and Sotades, *wrote descriptive encomiums on their* MYSTERIES. Which last, as we shall now shew, was the province undertaken by Apuleius; his *Metamorphosis* being nothing else but one continued RECOMMENDATION of them.

But to give what we have to say its proper force; let us, 1. enquire into the motives our Author might have for entering at all into the defence of Paganism: 2. His reasons for choosing this topic of defence, *the recommendation of the Mysteries.*

1. As to his defence of paganism in general, we may observe, 1. That works of this kind were very much in fashion, especially amongst the Philosophers of our author's Sect. 2. He was, as we have seen, most superstitiously devoted to pagan worship: and, 3. He bore a personal spite and prejudice to the Christian profession.

2. As to his making the defence of the *Mysteries* his choice, still stronger reasons may be assigned. 1. These were the Rites to which he was so peculiarly devoted, that he had contrived to be *initiated* into all the *Mysteries* of note, in the Roman world; and in several of them had borne the most distinguished offices. 2. The *Mysteries* being at this time become extremely corrupt, and consequently, in discredit, needed an able and zealous Apologist: both of which qualities met eminently in Apuleius. The corruptions were of two kinds, DEBAUCHERIES and MAGIC. The *Debaucheries* we have taken notice of, above: their *Magic* will be considered hereafter. But, 3. Our author's close attachment to *Mysterious rites* was, without question, the very thing that occa-

sioned all those suspicions and reports, which ended in an accusation of *Magic:* And, considering what hath been said of the corrupt state of the *Mysteries*, the reader will not wonder that it should.

Such then being the general character of the *Mysteries*, and of this their great Devotee, nothing was more natural than his projecting their defence; which, at the same time that it concurred to the support of Paganism in general, would vindicate his own credit, together with an Institution of which he was so immoderately fond. And the following considerations are sufficient to shew, that the *Metamorphosis* was written after his *Apology:* for, 1. His accusers never once mention the fable of the *Golden Ass* to support their charge of Magic, though they were in great want of proofs, and this lay so ready for their purpose. For, we are not to suppose that he alludes to the *Metamorphosis* in the following words of the Apology, ——Aggredior enim jam ad ipsum crimen *Magiæ*, quod ingenti tumultu, ad invidiam mei, accensum, frustrata expectatione omnium, per *nescio quas anileis fabulas* deflagravit. pp. 29, 30. The *idle tales* here hinted at, are the gossiping stories which went about of him, and which he afterwards exposes in the course of this defence. 2. He positively asserts before the tribunal of Maximus Claudius, that he had never given the least occasion to suspect him of *Magic:* " *Nusquam* passus sum *vel exiguam* suspicionem " *magiæ* consistere *."

Now Antiquity considered INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES as *a delivery from a living death of vice, brutality, and misery; and the beginning of a new life*

* P. 100, lin. 11.

of

of virtue, reason, and happiness *. This, therefore, was the very circumstance which our Author chose for the subject of his recommendation.

And as in the *Mysteries*, their moral and divine truths were represented in *shows* and *allegories*, so, in order to comply with this method of instruction, and in imitation of the ancient Masters of wisdom †, who borrowed their manner of teaching from thence, he hath artfully insinuated his doctrine in an agreeable Fable; and the fittest, one could conceive for his purpose, as will be seen when we come to examine it.

The foundation of this Allegory was a *Milesian Fable*, a species of polite trifling then much in vogue, and not unlike the modern *Arabian tales*. To allure his readers, therefore, with the promise of a *fashionable* work, he introduces his Metamorphosis in this manner: *At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram*, AURESQUE TUAS *benevolas lepido susurro* PERMULCEAM; plainly intimating that there was something of more consequence at bottom. But the *fashionable* people took him at his word; and, from that day to this, never troubled their heads about a further meaning. The OUTSIDE engaged all their attention, and sufficiently delighted them; as we may

* See what hath been said above, in the discourse of the Mysteries.

† Strabo acquaints us with the inducements which the ancients had to practise this method of Instruction.—Ὅταν δὲ προσῇ καὶ τὸ θαυμαστὸν καὶ τὸ τερατῶδες, ἐπιλείπει τὴν ἡδονὴν, ἥπερ ἐστὶ τῷ μανθάνειν φίλτρον. Καλαρχὰς μὲν ἔν ἀνάγκη τοιούτοις δέλεασι χρῆσθαι· προϊούσης δὲ τῆς ἡλικίας ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὅλων μάθησιν ἄγειν, ἤδη τῆς διανοίας ἐρρωμένης, καὶ μηκέτι δεομένης κολάκων. Καὶ ἰδιώτης δὲ πᾶς καὶ ἀπαίδευτος, τρόπον τινὰ πᾶς ἐστι, φιλομυθεῖ τε ὡσαύτως. Geog. l. i. p. 19. A. Edit. Paris. fol. 1620.

gather from the early title it bore of ASINUS AUREUS. And, from the beginning of one of Pliny's epistles, I suspect that AUREÆ was the common title given to the *Milesian*, and such like tales as Strolers used to tell for a piece of money to the rabble in a circle. Pliny's words are these—assem para, et accipe AUREAM fabulam*. Unless we will rather suppose it to have been bestowed by the few intelligent readers in the secret; for, in spite of the Author's repeated preparation, a secret it was, and so, all along continued.

Upon one of these popular Fables, he chose to ingraft his instruction; taking a celebrated Tale from the *collections* of one Lucius of Patræ; who relates his transformation into an Ass, and his adventures under that shape. Lucian has epitomised this story, as Apuleius seems to have paraphrased it: and the subject being a METAMORPHOSIS, it admirably fitted his purpose; as the METEMPSYCHOSIS, to which that superstition belongs, was one of the fundamental doctrines of the *Mysteries*. But from Photius's account of Lucius Patrencis one would be inclined to rank him amongst those who composed books of *Metamorphosis* [see B. iii. Sect. 3.] according to the popular Theology, rather than a writer of Milesian fables. He entitles Lucius's work μεταμορφώσεως λόγοι διάφοροι. And after having said that Lucian borrowed his *Ass* from thence, to ridicule pagan religion, he goes on †; "but Lucius giving a more serious turn to his Meta-

* L. ii. Ep. 20.

† ὁ δὲ Λεκίος σπεδάζων τε, καὶ πιστὰς νομίζων τὰς ἐξ ανθρώπων εἰς ἀλλήλες μεταμορφώσεις, τάς τε ἐξ ἀλόγων εἰς ἀνθρώπες, καὶ ἀνάπαλιν· καὶ τὸν ἄλλον τῶν ΠΑΛΑΙΩΝ ΜΥΘΩΝ ὕθλον καὶ φλήναφον γραφῇ παρεδίδε ταῦτα, καὶ συνύφαινον. Bibl. Ed. Gen. p. 311.

morphosis,

morphosis, and treating as realities these changes of Men into one another, of Men into Beasts, and so on the contrary, hath weaved together these and many other of the trifles and absurdities of the Ancient Mythology, and committed them to writing for the entertainment of the Public." This will account for the oddness of Apuleius's expressions, with which he introduces his *Fable*——Et figuras fortunasque hominum in alias imagines conversas et in se rursum MUTUO NEXU refectas, ut mireris, exordior,—— words by no means suiting with the single transformation, and story of the *golden ass*, but very expressive of the nature of such a work as that of Lucius Patrensis, according to the idea which Photius gives us of it. From whence I conclude, that Apuleius might translate these very words from his original author.

The Fable opens with the representation of a young man, personated by himself, sensible of the advantages of *virtue* and *piety*, but immoderately fond of PLEASURE, and as curious of MAGIC. Apuleius takes care to keep up the first part of this character as he goes along, *familiaris* CURIOSITATIS *admonitus*, l. iii. *familiari* CURIOSITATE *attonitus*, l. ix. And *Curiosus* and *Magus* were used by the Antients as Synonymous. So Apuleius himself—*At ego* CURIOSUS *alioquin, ut primum* ARTIS MAGICÆ *semper optatum nomen audivi*, p. 24. Hence it is that he is represented as having been initiated in all the *corrupt Mysteries*, where Magic was professedly practised. *Fotis*, the inferior Priestess in the magic rites of the Inchantress, *Pamphile*, enjoining him silence, says, *sacris pluribus initiatus*, profecto nôsti sanctam silentii fidem*. As to the second, we have his adventure with *Byrrhena* and

* P. 53.

Pamphile, which seems to be borrowed from Prodicus's fable of the contest between *Virtue* and *Pleasure* for the young *Hercules*. Byrrhena meets our adventurer, pretends to be his relation*, and tells him that she brought him up from his infancy: by which is intimated that virtue was most natural to him. She leads him home to her house, which is described as a magnificent palace: one of its principal ornaments is the history of Diana †; where the punishment of Actæon is not forgotten ‡, as a seasonable lesson against *vicious curiosity*. And to keep him to herself, she promises to make him heir of all her fortunes. Then taking him apart, she warns him to beware of the mischievous practices of his hostess Pamphile. "Per hanc, inquit, "Deam (Dianam) ô Luci carissime, ut anxie tibi "metuo, et, utpote pignori meo, longe provisum cupio, "cave tibi, sed *cave fortiter*, a malis artibus, et "facinorosis illecebris Pamphiles illius, — MAGÆ "primi nominis, et omnis carminis sepulcralis magistra "creditur: quæ surculis et lapillis, et id genus frivolis "inhalatis, omnem istam lucem mundi sideralis imis "Tartari, et in vetustum chaos submergere novit. "Nam cum quemquam conspexerit speciosæ formæ "juvenem, venustate ejus sumitur: et illico," *&c.*

But Lucius makes a choice very different from that of Hercules. He had promised to observe *Byrrhena's*

* Ego te, o Luci, meis istis manibus educavi: quidni? parentis tuæ non modo sanguinis, verum alimoniarum etiam socia fui, p. 23.

† Ecce lapis Parius in Dianam factus tenet libratum totius loci medietatem, signum perfecte luculentum, — introeuntibus obvium, & majestate numinis venerabile, &c. p. 22.

‡ Inter medias frondes lapidis Actæonis simulacrum, curioso obtutu in dorsum projectus, &c. p. 23.

admonitions, and to return to her again: but a circumstance of immoderate mirth intervening, he found in himself a more than ordinary aversion to keep his word. Ad hæc ego formidans et procul perhorrescens etiam ipsam domum ejus, &c.* This is a fine circumstance, nothing being so great an enemy to modesty and chastity (figured in the person of Byrrhena) as immoderate mirth. He gives a loose to his vicious appetite for *Pleasure* and *Magic:* and the crimes and follies into which they lead him soon end in his transformation to a BRUTE.

This contrivance of the introductory part is artful; and finely insinuates the great moral of the piece, THAT BRUTALITY ATTENDS VICE AS IT'S PUNISHMENT: and punishment by actual transformation was keeping up to the popular opinion†. His making a passion for *Magic* contribute to this dreadful change is no less ingenious, as it cleared both *himself* and the *Mysteries* from that imputation; for it appeared that *Magic* was so far from being innocent, that in his opinion, it was attended with the severest punishment; so far from being encouraged by the *Mysteries*, that they only could relieve men from the distresses which this vicious curiosity brought upon it's votaries; as is shewn by the catastrophe of the Piece.

St. Austin permitted himself to doubt whether Apuleius's account of his change into an ASS was not a true relation. — *Sicut Apuleius, in libris quos Asini aurei titulo inscripsit, sibi ipsi accidisse, ut accepto veneno, humano animo permanente, asinus fieret,* AUT INDICAVIT *aut finxit*‡. I shall say nothing to so

* P. 51. † See B. iii. Sect. 3.

‡ Civ. Dei, l. xviii. c. 18.

extravagant

extravagant a doubt, but only observe, that it appears from hence, that St. Austin esteemed Apuleius a profligate in his manners, and addicted to the superstitions of *Magic*. And yet it is by no means credible, that he who took so much pains, in a very serious and public way *, to free himself from these imputations, should afterwards wantonly undo all he had so successfully performed in support of a doubtful reputation, by an unnecessary narrative of his own early debaucheries. But it may be said, that all this happened in his youth; and that his subsequent *Initiations* had purified his manners: But neither will his APOLOGY admit of this supposition; for there he expressly insists on the virtue of his youth. "De eloquentia vero, "si qua mihi fuisset, neque mirum, neque invidiosum "deberet videri, si *ab ineunte ævo* unis studiis litterarum ex summis viribus deditus, omnibus aliis spretis "voluptatibus *ad hoc ævi*, haud sciam anne super "omneis homines impenso labore, diuque noctuque, "cum despectu et dispendio bonæ valetudinis, eam "quæsissem — Quis enim me hoc quidem pacto "eloquentior vivat? quippe qui nihil *unquam* cogitavi "quod eloqui non auderem. Eundem me aio facundissimum; nam *omne peccatum* semper nefas habui. "Eundem disertissimum; quod nullum meum factum "vel dictum extet, de quo disserere publice non "possim †." What have we then to conclude but that the representation of himself in this *Fable*, under a debauched character, is entirely feigned? Yet still it would be as absurd to imagine that a grave and moral Philosopher should chuse to exhibit himself to the public in the odious, and false light of a *Magician* and

* His Apology. † P. 6. lin. 10.

Debauchee;

Debauchee; and take a pleasure in dwelling upon the horrors of so detestable a Character, for no other purpose than to amuse and entertain a set of dissolute readers. We must needs therefore go a step further, and conclude that he assumed it only for the sake of the GENERAL MORAL, and the better to carry on his Allegory; which was, to recommend the MYSTERIES as the certain cure for all the DISORDERS OF THE WILL.

This being his end, he was but too much encouraged by the example of the most moral of the ancient Satirists, to particularize the various maladies to which he was applying a remedy. Let this, and his copying only what he found in his original Author, stand for some kind of excuse in a wretched Pagan; and it is the best we have, for all the obscenities with which his Fable abounds.

But to proceed with his plan. Having now shewn himself thoroughly brutalized by his crimes; he goes on to represent at large the miseries of that condition, in a long detail of his misadventures; in the course of which he fell, by turns, under the dominion of every vicious passion; though the incidents are chiefly confined to the mischiefs of unlawful love: And this, with much judgment, as one of the principal ends of the *Mysteries* was to curb and subdue this inordinance, which brings more general and lasting misery upon Mankind than all the other. And as it was the great moral of his piece to show *that pure religion* (such as a platonic Philosopher esteemed pure) *was the only remedy for human corruption*; so, to prevent the abuse or mistake of this capital Principle, he takes care to inform us, *that an attachment to superstitious and corrupt Religion does but plunge the wretched victim into*

into still greater miseries. This he finely illustrates, in the history of his adventures with the BEGGING PRIESTS OF CYBELE, whose enormities are related in the eighth and ninth books; and whose CORRUPT MYSTERIES are intended as a contrast to the PURE RITES OF ISIS: With which, in a very studied description and encomium, he concludes the *Fable.*

In the mean time, matters growing from bad to worse, and Lucius plunged deeper and deeper in the sink of vice, his affairs come to a crisis. For this is one great beauty in the conduct of the Fable, that every change of station, while he remains a brute, makes his condition still more wretched and deplorable. And being now (in the *ninth* book) about to perpetrate one of the most shocking enormities; NATURE, though so deeply brutalized, REVOLTS; he abhors the idea of his projected crime; he evades his keepers; he flies to the sea-shore; and, in this solitude, begins to reflect more seriously on his lost condition. This is finely imagined; for we often see men, even after a whole life of horrors, come suddenly to themselves on the hideous aspect of some Monster-vice too frightful even for an hardened Reprobate to bear. Nor is it with less judgment that the Author makes these beginnings of reformation confirmed by solitude; when the unhappy victim of PLEASURE hath broken loose from the companions and partakers of his follies.

And now, a more intimate acquaintance with his hopeless condition obliges him to fly to Heaven for relief. The MOON is in full splendour; and the awful silence of the night inspires him with sentiments of Religion.—" Video præmicantis Lunæ candore " nimio completum orbem,—nactusque opacæ noctis " silentiosa secreta, certus etiam SUMMATEM DEAM " præcipua

" præcipua majestate pollere, resque prorsus humanas " ipsius regi *providentia*," etc *. He then purifies himself in the manner prescribed by PYTHAGORAS †; the Philosopher most addicted to *Initiations* of all the early Sages, as Apuleius, of all the later; and so makes his prayer to the *Moon* or ISIS; invoking her by her several names of the *Eleusinian Ceres*, the *celestial Venus*, *Diana* and *Proserpine*: when betaking himself to repose, she appears to him in a dream ‡. This was not a circumstance of the Fabulist's mere invention. Pausanias tells us " that in Phocis there " was a Chapel consecrated to Isis, of all the places " of worship, which the Greeks erected to this Egyp- " tian Goddess, by far the most holy: that to this " sacred place it was not lawful for any to approach, " but such whom the Goddess had invited, and ap- " peared to, in a *Dream*, for that purpose §." Here

* P. 238.

† — meque protinus, purificandi studio, marino lavacro trado: septiesque submerso fluctibus capite, quod eum numerum præcipue religioni aptissimum divinus ille Pythagoras prodidit—p. 238.

‡ Artemidorus says, that for a man to dream that Ceres, Proserpine, or Bacchus appears to him, betokens some extraordinary good fortune to happen to him. Δημήτης καὶ Κόρη καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰακχος τοῖς μεμυημένοις ταῖς θεαῖς ἀγαθόν τι καὶ ὠφέλιμον τὸ τύχον ἐσόμενον σημαίνουσι. l. iv. c. 44. The ancient ONIROCRITICS, as we have observed, B. iv. Sect. 4. were not founded on the arbitrary fancies of the impostors who professed that art, but on the customs and superstitions of the times, and with a principal reference to the Egyptian HIEROGLYPHICS and MYSTERIES.

§ Τῷ δὲ Ἀσκληπιῷ περὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἀπέχει σταδίους περίβολος, καὶ ἄδυτον ἱερὸν Ἴσιδος ἁγιώτατον ὁπόσα Ἕλληνες θεῷ τῇ Αἰγυπτίᾳ ποιοῦνται. Οὔτε γὰρ περιοικεῖν ἐπιτέτραπται οἱ Τιθοραιεῖς νομίζουσιν, ὅτε ἔσοδος ἐς τὸ ἄδυτον ἄλλοις γε ἢ ἐκείνοις ἐστὶν, οὓς ἂν αὐτὴ προκαλέσασα ἡ Ἶσις καλέσῃ σφᾶς δι' ἐνυπνίων. Lib. x. c. 32. p. 880. Edit. Kuhnii, Lips. fol. 1696.

she

she appears under the SHINING IMAGE so much spoken of by the *Mystics*, as representing the divine nature in general *. "Necdum satis conniveram: et ecce "pelago medio, venerandos Diis etiam vultus attol- "lens, emergit *divina facies*, ac dehinc paulatim toto "corpore PER LUCIDUM SIMULACRUM, excusso pe- "lago, ante me constitisse visum est. Ejus miran- "dam speciem ad vos etiam referre connitar—Corona "multiformis, variis floribus sublimen distinxerat "verticem: cujus media quidem super fronte *plana* "*rotunditas*, candidum lumen emicabat. Dextra "lævaque sulcis *insurgentium viperarum* cohibita, "*spicis* etiam *Cerealibus* desuper porrectis.—Et quæ "longe longeque etiam meum confutabat obtutum, "*palla* nigerrima, splendescens atro nitore; quæ "circum circa remeans,—per intextam extremitatem, "et in ipsa oræ planitie, *stellæ* dispersæ coruscabant: "earumque media semestris Luna flammeos spirabat "ignes.—Dextera quidem ferebat *æreum crepitacu-* "*lum:* cujus per angustam laminam in modum bal- "thei recurvatam, trajectæ mediæ paucæ virgulæ, "crispante brachio tergeminos jactus, reddebant, ar- "gutum sonitum †." These several symbolic Attributes, the *lucid Round*, the *snakes*, the *ears of corn*, and the *sistrum*, represent the tutelar Deities of the *Hecatæan*, *Bacchic*, *Eleusinian* and *Isiac* MYSTERIES. That is, MYSTIC RITES IN GENERAL; for whose sake the allegory was invented. As the black Palla in which she is wrapped, embroidered with a silver moon, and stars, denotes the TIME, in which the Mysteries were celebrated, namely the dead of NIGHT; which was so constant and inseparable a circumstance, that the author calls *initiation*, NOCTIS SOCIETAS.

* See above, p. 144. note (§). † P. 239, 240.

In

In her speech to Lucius she gives this extraordinary account of herself, "En assum, tuis commota Lucî "precibus, RERUM NATURA PARENS, elementorum "omnium Domina, sæculorum progenies initialis, "Summa numinum, Regina manium, Prima cœlitum, "Deorum Dearumque facies uniformis: quæ cœli "luminosa culmina, maris salubria flamina, inferorum "deplorata silentia nutibus meis dispenso. Cujus "numen unicum, multiformi specie, ritu vario, nomine "multijugo totus veneratur orbis—priscaque doctrina "pollentes ÆGYPTII, ceremoniis me prorsus PRO-"PRIIS percolentes, appellant vero nomine reginam "ISIDEM *." This was exactly adapted to the design of the *Mysteries*; and preparatory to the communication of the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ. It had likewise this further use, to patch up and recommend the PAGAN RELIGIONS; by shewing that their *Polytheism* consisted in nothing else than in giving the SUPREME GOD various NAMES, merely expressive of his various ATTRIBUTES. This was the fashionable colouring, which, after the appearance of Christianity, the advocates of paganism employed to blanch their IDOLATRY. I will only observe further, that the words, *Ægyptii ceremoniis me prorsus propriis percolentes*, insinuate, what was true, that all MYSTERIOUS WORSHIP came first from ÆGYPT; this people having penetrated furthest into the nature of the Gods: As the calling HER, who represents the *Mysteries in general*, RERUM NATURA PARENS, shews plainly what were the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ of them all.

PARENT NATURE then reveals to Lucius the means of his recovery. Her festival was on the following day; when there was to be a Procession of her Vota-

* P. 241.

ries.

ries. The Priest who led it up (she told him) would have a chaplet of ROSES in his hand, which had the virtue to restore him to his former shape. But as breaking through a habit of vice is, of all things, the most difficult; she adds encouragements to her promises, "nec quidquam rerum mearum reformides, "ut arduum. Nam hoc eodem momento, quo tibi "venio, simul et ibi PRÆSENS, quæ sunt consequentia "sacerdoti meo per quietem facienda præcipio*." Alluding to what was taught in the *Mysteries*, that the *assistance of Heaven* was always *present* to second the efforts of virtue. But in return for the favour of releasing him from his brutal shape, i. e. of reforming his manners by *Initiation*, she tells him she expected the service of his whole life; And this, the *Mysteries* required: Nor should her service (she said) go unrewarded, for he should have a place in ELYSIUM hereafter; And this, too, the *Mysteries* promised. "Plane memineris, et penita mente conditum semper "tenebis, *mihi reliqua vitæ tuæ curricula*, ad usque "terminos ultimi spiritus *vadata*. Nec injurium, "cujus beneficio redieris ad homines ei totum debere "quod vives. Vives autem *beatus*, vives, in meâ "tutela, *gloriosus:* et cum spatium seculi tui per-"mensus ad inferos demearis; ibi quoque in ipsô "subterraneo semirotundo, me, quam vides Acherontis "tenebris interlucentem, stygiisque penetralibus reg-"nantem, CAMPOS ELYSIOS *incolens ipse*, tibi pro-"pitiam frequens adorabis †."

Lucius is at length confirmed in his resolution of *aspiring* to a life of virtue. And on this change of his dispositions, and intire conquest of his passions, the Author finely represents all Nature as putting on

* P. 242. † Ibid.

a new

a new face of chearfulness and gaiety. "Tanta hila-
"ritudine præter peculiarem meam gestire mihi
"cuncta videbantur; ut pecua etiam cujuscemodi,
"et totas domos, et ipsum diem serena facie gaudere
"sentirem *." And to enjoy Nature, in these her best conditions, was the boasted privilege of the *Initiated*, as we may see from a Chorus in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes †.

And now the Procession, in honour of Isis, begins. Where by the way, we must observe, that the *two first days* of the celebration of the *Eleusinian Mysteries* are plainly described: the one called ΑΓΥΡΜΟΣ, from the multitude assembled; the other ΑΛΑΔΕ ΜΥΣΤΑΙ, from the Procession made to the sea-shore. "Tunc
"influunt *Turbæ* sacris divinis initiatæ ‡—jam *ripam*
"*maris* proximamus §." The Priest or Hierophant of the Rites leads up the train of the Initiated with a garland of Roses in his hand. Lucius approaches, devours the Roses, and, according to the promise of the Goddess, is restored to his native form: by which, as we have said, no more was meant than a change of Manners, from vice to virtue. And this the author plainly intimates by making the Goddess thus address him under his brutal Figure, "pessimæ mihique de-
"testabilis jamdudum beluæ istius corio te protinus
"exue ‖." For an Ass was so far from being *detestable*, that it was employed in the celebration of her rites; and was ever found in the retinue of Osiris or Bacchus. The *garland* plainly represents that which

* P. 243.

† Μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἥλιος.
Καὶ φέγγος ἱλαρόν ἐστιν
Ὅσοι μεμυήμεθ'—Act. i.

‡ P. 245.

§ P. 249.

‖ P. 242.

the aspirants were crowned with at their *initiation:* just as the *virtue* of the Roses designs the *Mysteries.* At his transformation he had been told, that ROSES were to restore him to Humanity: so that, amid all his adventures, he had still this remedy in view. Particularly in a circumstance of great distress, he met with a species of them called *rosa laurea*; but on examining its properties, he found that, instead of a restorative, it was a deadly poison to all kind of cattle —"quarum cuncto pecori cibus lethalis est." Who can doubt then, but by this *rose-laurel* was meant all *debauched, magical, and corrupt Mysteries,* such as those of the SYRIAN GODDESS, whose ministers he represents in so abominable a light*; in opposition to what he calls "sobriæ religionis observatio:" and in those Rites, *initiation* was so far from promoting a life of virtue, that it plunged the deluded Votary into still greater miseries. These *emblematic Roses* were not of our author's invention. For the ROSE, amongst the Ancients, was a symbol of SILENCE, the requisite quality of the *Initiated.* And therefore the statues of Isis or Diana Multimammea, (images consecrated to the use of the *Mysteries*) are crowned with chaplets of Roses; designing what we now mean, when we say, in proverbial speech, UNDER THE ROSE.

Our Author proceeds to tell us, that the people wondered at this instantaneous Metamorphosis. Populi mirantur, *religiosi venerantur* tam evidentem maximi numinis potentiam—et *facilitatem reformationis* †. For the *Mysteries* boasted the power of giving a sudden and entire change to the mind and affections: And the advocates of Paganism against

* L. viii. p. 174. † P. 247, 248.

Christianity

Christianity used to oppose this boast to the real and miraculous efficacy of GRACE.

As soon as Lucius had recovered the integrity of his nature, by *initiation*, the Priest covers him, naked as he was, with a LINEN garment*: A habit always bestowed upon the Aspirant, on his admission to the *Mysteries*; the *rationale* of which, Apuleius himself gives us in his Apology †.

When all was over, the Priest accosts his Penitent in the following manner: " Multis et variis exantlatis " laboribus, magnisque Fortunæ tempestatibus, et " maximis actis procellis, ad portum quietis et *aram* " *Misericordiæ* tandem, Lucî, venisti: nec tibi na- " tales, ac ne dignitas quidem vel ipsa, qua flores, " usquam doctrina profuit: sed lubrico virentis æta- " tulæ, *ad serviles delapsus voluptates,* CURIOSITATIS " IMPROSPERÆ sinistrum præmium reportâsti. Sed " utrinque Fortunæ cæcitas dum te pessimis periculis " discrutiat, *ad religiosam istam habitudinem* impro- " vida produxit malitia. Eat nunc, et summo furore " sæviat, et crudelitati suæ materiam quærat aliam. " Nam in eorum vitas, *quorum sibi servitium Deæ* " *nostræ majestas vindicavit, non habet locum casus* " *infestus.* Quid latrones, quid feræ, quid servitium, " quid asperrimorum itinerum ambages reciprocæ,

* Sed sacerdos, utcunque *divino monitu cognitis ab origine cunctis cladibus meis*, quamquam et ipse insigni permotus miraculo, nutu significato prius præcipit, tegendo mihi LINTEAM dari LACINIAM. P. 248.

† *Lana* segnissimi corporis excrementum, pecori detracta, jam inde Orphei et Pythagoræ scitis, profanus vestitus est. Sed enim mundissima LINI seges, inter optimas fruges terræ exorta non modo *indutui et amictui sanctissimis Ægyptiorum sacerdotibus*, sed opertui quoque in *rebus sacris* usurpatur. Apol. p. 64. l. 17.

" quid metus mortis quotidianæ nefariæ Fortunæ pro-
" fuit? in tutelam jam receptus es FORTUNÆ, *sed*
" VIDENTIS; *quæ* SUÆ LUCIS SPLENDORE *ceteros*
" *etiam deos illuminat.* Sume jam vultum lætiorem,
" *candido isto habitu tuo* congruentem; comitare
" pompam Deæ SOSPITATRICIS innovanti gradu;
" VIDEANT IRRELIGIOSI: VIDEANT, ET ERROREM
" SUUM RECOGNOSCANT. En ecce pristinis ærumnis
" absolutus, ISIDIS *magnæ* PROVIDENTIA *gaudens*
" *Lucius de sua fortuna triumphat* *."

Here the MORAL OF THE FABLE is delivered in plain terms; and, in this *moral*, all we have advanced, concerning the purpose of the work, fully confirmed. It is expressly declared, that VICE and inordinate CURIOSITY were the causes of Lucius's disasters; from which the only relief was INITIATION into the MYSTERIES. Whereby the Author would insinuate, that nothing was more abhorrent from those holy rites than DEBAUCHERY and MAGIC; the two enormities they were then commonly suspected to encourage.

It hath been observed above, that by Lucius's return to his proper Form, was meant his *initiation*; and accordingly, that return is called (as *initiation* was) *the being born again* — ut RENATUS quodammodo, and — sua providentia quodammodo RENATOS; but this was only to the LESSER, not the GREATER *mysteries*. The first was to *purify* the mind: hence it was called by the Ancients, Κακίας ἀφαίρεσιν, a *separation from evil:* the *second* was to *enlighten* it, when purified, and to bring it to the knowledge of divine secrets, as Hierocles speaks, ἔπειτα ἔτω ἐπιβάλλει τῇ τῶν θειοτέρων γνώσει. Hence they named the one ΚΑΘΑΡΣΙΝ, and

* P. 248, 249.

the

the other ΤΕΛΕΙΟΤΗΤΑ, PURIFICATION and PERFECTION. The *first* is here represented in the incident of Lucius's being restored to humanity by the use of *roses:* The *second*, as the matter of chief importance, the Author treats more circumstantially.

He begins with making the Priest take occasion, from the benefit already received, to press Lucius to enter into the GREATER MYSTERIES of Isis. "Quo tibi "tamen tutior sis, atque munitior; da nomen huic "*sanctæ militiæ*, cujus olim sacramento etiam læta- "beris; teque jam nunc obsequio religionis nostræ "dedica, et ministerii jugum subi voluntarium. *Nam,* "*cum cœperis Deæ servire, tunc magis senties* "*fructum tuæ libertatis**." But at the same time makes him inform the Candidate, that nothing was to be precipitated: for that not only many previous Rites and Ceremonies, concerning religious diet, and abstinence from prophane food, were to be observed; but that the Aspirants to these *higher Mysteries* were to wait for A CALL. "Quippe cum aviditati contumaciæque "summe cavere, et utramque culpam vitare, ac neque "vocatus morari, nec non jussus festinare deberem. "Nec tamen esse quemquam de suo numero tam "perditæ mentis, vel immo destinatæ mortis, qui non "sibi quoque seorsum, jubente Domina, temerarium "atque sacrilegum audeat ministerium subire, noxam- "que letalem contrahere. Nam et infêrum claustra, "et salutis tutelam in Deæ manu posita ipsamque "traditionem ad instar voluntariæ mortis et præcariæ "salutis celebrari †." Accordingly, he is initiated into the GREATER MYSTERIES. The ceremony is described at large ‡; and we find it to agree exactly with what,

* P. 249. † P. 253, 254. ‡ P. 255, 256, 257.

we have shewn, other ancient writers more professedly deliver concerning it.

The Author, by the doubts and apprehensions which retarded his *initiation*, first gives us to understand, that the highest degree of sanctity was required of those who entered into the *Mysteries*: — "At ego, "quamquam cupienti voluntate præditus, tamen "religiosa formidine retinebar. Quod enim sedulo "percontaveram, *difficile religionis obsequium, et* "*castimoniorum abstinentiam satis arduam, cautoque* "*circumspectu vitam, quæ multis casibus subjacet,* "*esse muniendam**." These difficulties now surmounted, he is *initiated* with the accustomed Ceremonies. He then makes his Prayer, in which the grand ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ of the *Mysteries* is still † more plainly referred to. "Tu quidem sancta et humani generis "SOSPITATRIX perpetua, semper fovendis mortali- "bus munifica, dulcem matris affectionem miserorum "casibus tribuis.—TE SUPERI COLUNT; OBSERVANT "INFERI; TU ROTAS ORBEM; LUMINAS SOLEM; "REGIS MUNDUM; CALCAS TARTARUM; TIBI "RESPONDENT SIDERA ‡; GAUDENT LUMINA; "REDEUNT TEMPORA; SERVIUNT ELEMENTA; TUO "NUTU SPIRANT FLAMINA; NUTRIUNTUR NUBILA; "GERMINANT SEMINA; CRESCUNT GERMINA; "TUAM MAJESTATEM PERHORRESCUNT AVES COELO "MEANTES; FERÆ MONTIBUS ERRANTES; SER-

* P. 252.

† See the quotation above.—*Fortunæ Videntis, quæ suæ lucis splendore ceteros etiam Deos illuminat.*

‡ *Respondent sidera.* This, I suppose, relates to the *music of the spheres.* The image is noble and sublime. It is taken from the *consent* in the lyre, to answer to, and obey the hand of the Master who had put them into tune.

"PENTES

" PENTES SOLO LATENTES; BELUÆ PONTO NA-
" TANTES *."

The affair thus over, and the honour attendant on *initiation* into the *greater Mysteries* being marked out in the words—*cominabar sacrarium; totæ civitati notus ac conspicuus, digitis hominum nutibusque notabilis* †; the Author, in the next place, takes occasion, agreeably to his real practice and opinions, to recommend a MULTIPLICITY OF INITIATIONS. He tells us how *Isis* counselled him to enter into the *Mysteries* of *Osiris:* how, after that, she invited him to a third *initiation:* and then rewarded him for his accumulated Piety with an abundance of temporal Blessings.

All this considered, we can no longer doubt but that the true design of his work was to recommend INITIATION INTO THE MYSTERIES, IN OPPOSITION TO THE NEW RELIGION. We see the Catastrophe of the piece, the whole Eleventh Book, entirely taken up with it; and composed with the greatest seriousness and superstition.

And, surely, nothing could be better conceived, to recommend the *Mysteries*, than the idea of such a plan; or better contrived than his execution of it. In which he omits no circumstance that might be plausibly opposed to CHRISTIANITY; or that might recommend the MYSTERIES with advantage to the Magistrate's protection: as where he tells us, that in these Rites, *they prayed for the prosperity of all Orders in the* STATE — " fausta vota præfatus principi magno, senatuique et equiti, totique populo Romano."

This interpretation will throw new light on *every part* of the GOLDEN ASS. But I have been so long

* P. 257, 258. † P. 249.

upon the subject, that I have only time to give one instance; and this, chiefly because it reflects light back again on my general interpretation of the Fable.

In the fifth and sixth books is the long episode of CUPID and PSYCHE; visibly allegorical throughout; and entirely foreign to all the rest of the work, considered as a mere Milesian fable; but very applicable to the Writer's purpose, if he had that moral to inculcate which we have here assigned unto him.

There was no man, though he regarded the *golden Ass* as a thing of mere amusement, but saw that the story of CUPID and PSYCHE was a *philosophic allegory of the progress of the soul to perfection, in the possession of divine love and the reward of immortality.* The Amour of Cupid and Psyche was a subject which lay in common amongst the Platonic writers. And though originally founded on some obscure tradition of the *Fall of Man*, yet every one fashioned this agreeable fiction (as our Author has done here) according to the doctrines he had to convey under it. By this means it could not but become famous. The remaining monuments of ancient sculpture convince us that it was very famous; in which, nothing is so common as the figures of CUPID and PSYCHE in the various circumstances of their adventures. Now we have shewn at large, that the professed end of the *Mysteries*, in the later ages of their celebrity, was to restore the soul to it's ORIGINAL RECTITUDE, and, in every age, to encourage good men with the promises of *happiness in another life.* The fable, therefore, of *Cupid and Psyche*, in the fifth and sixth books, was the finest and most artful preparative for the subject of the eleventh, which treats professedly of the *Mysteries.*

But

But if we look more nearly into this beautiful Fable, we shall find that, besides its general purpose, it has one more particular.

We have observed that the *corrupt state* of the *Mysteries*, in the time of Apuleius, was one principal reason of his undertaking their apology. These corruptions were of two kinds, DEBAUCHERIES and MAGIC. Their *debaucheries* have been taken notice of above. Their MAGIC was of three sorts: 1. The Magic of invocation or NECROMANCY. 2. The Magic of transformation or METAMORPHOSIS. 3. And the Magic of divine communication under a visible appearance or THEÜRGY. The ORACULAR RESPONSES, introduced late into the *Mysteries*, seem to have given birth to the first: The Doctrine of the METEMPSYCHOSIS taught therein, to the second: and the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ concerning the DIVINE NATURE, to the third. The abomination of the two first sorts was seen by all, and frankly given up as criminal: but the fanatic Platonists and Pythagoreans of the latter ages, espousing the third, occasioned it to be held in esteem and reverence. So that, as Heliodorus tells us, the Egyptian priests (between whose fanaticism and that of the Platonists there was, at this time, a kind of coalition *) affected to distinguish between the MAGIC of *Necromancy* and the magic of *Theürgy*; accounting the first infamous and wicked; but the last very fair, and even commendable. For now both those philosophic Enthusiasts had their *mysterious Rites*, which consisted in the practice of this THEÜRGIC MAGIC. These were the *Mysteries*, to observe it by the way, of which the Emperor Julian was so fond, that he placed his

* See Book iii. Sect. 4. towards the end.

principal

principal felicity (in what the Christians placed his principal crime) their celebration. But our Author, who had imbibed his Platonism, not at the muddy streams of those late Fanatics, but at the pure fountain head of the Academy itself, well understood how much this superstition, with all it's plausible pretences, had polluted the *Mysteries*; and, therefore, as in the course of the adventures of his *golden Ass*, he had stigmatized the two other kinds of *Magic*, he composed this celebrated tale (hitherto so little understood) to expose the Magic of THEÜRGY. It is, as we said, *a philosophic Allegory of the progress of the Soul to perfection, in the possession of Divine Love and the reward of immortality*, delivered in the adventures of PSYCHE, or the *Soul:* whose various labours and traverses in this *Progress*, are all represented as the effects of her indiscreet passion for that species of *magic* called THEÜRGY.

To understand this, we must observe, that the fanatic Platonists, in their pursuit of the SUPREME GOOD, the *Union with the Deity*, made the completion and perfection of it to consist in the *Theürgic* Vision of the Αὐτοπτον Αγαλμα or SELF-SEEN IMAGE, i. e. seen by the splendour of its own light. Now the story tells us, there were three Sisters, the youngest of whom was called PSYCHE; by which we are to understand, the *three peripatetic souls*, the *sensitive*, the *animal*, and the *rational*; or in other words, *sense*, *appetite*, and *reason*.

That the two elder Sisters, *Sense* and *Appetite*, were soon disposed of in marriage; but that the younger, PSYCHE or the *rational Soul*, was of so transcendent and divine a beauty, that though men forsook the

altars of the Gods to follow and worship her *, having paid her their full homage of admiration, not so much as one aspired to a closer union with her: intimating the general preference given to temporal things above spiritual:

Virtus laudatur & alget.

However, amidst this neglect, she is happily contracted to, and possesses, the *celestial Cupid*, or DIVINE LOVE, who cohabits with her INVISIBLY amidst a scene of paradisaical pleasures and enjoyments. But is warned by Cupid not to hearken to the pernicious counsel of her sisters, whose envy at her happiness, from their own choice of husbands diseased and avaricious †, the lot of those under the dominion of their appetites, would soon bring them to attempt her ruin, in persuading her to get a sight of her *invisible* spouse. Against which SACRILEGIOUS CURIOSITY, as what would deprive her of all her happiness ‡, and to which her sisters would endeavour to inflame her mind, he carefully warns her. By all which the Author would insinuate, that they are the irregular passions and the ungovernable appetites which stir up men's *curiosity* to this species of *magic*, the THEÜRGIC VISION. However, Psyche falls into the snare her sisters had

* Apuleii Met. ed. Pricæi, p. 85. Interea Psyche, cum sua sibi præcipua pulchritudine nullum decoris sui fructum percipit. Spectatur ab omnibus; laudatur ab omnibus, nec quisquam—cupiens ejus nuptiarum petitur accedit.

† P. 94.

‡ Identidem monuit, ac sæpe terruit, ne quando sororum pernicioso consilio suasa, de *forma Mariti* quærat: neve se SACRILEGA CURIOSITATE de tanto fortunarum suggestu pessum dejiciat; nec suum postea contingat amplexum. P. 92.

laid

laid for her, and against the express injunction of the God, sacrilegiously attempts this *forbidden* sight; though he assured her *, that if she kept the religious secret, the child to be born of them should be immortal; but if she prophaned it, the child would be mortal, intimating, that Theürgic Magic was so far from rendering the participants divine, that it loaded them with impiety. In a word, she indulges her inordinate appetite, and is undone: *Divine Love* forsakes her; the happy scenes of her abode vanish; and she finds herself forlorn and abandoned, surrounded with miseries, and pursued with the vengeance of heaven by its instrument the *Celestial Venus.*

In this distress she first comes to the temple of CERES for protection; by which is meant the custom of having recourse to the *Mysteries* against the evils and disasters of life, as is plainly intimated in the reason given for her application—" nec ullam vel du-" biam SPEI MELIORIS viam volens omittere †." *Spes melior* being the common appellation for what was sought for in the *Mysteries*, and what they promised to the participants. With these sentiments she addresses *Ceres* in the following observation: " Per " ego te frugiferam tuam dextram istam deprecor—" per *tacita sacra cistarum*—per—per, et cetera *quæ* " *silentio tegit Eleusinis Atticæ sacrarium*——‡" But Psyche is denied any protection both here and at the temple of *Juno:* for the purer *Mysteries* discouraged all kind of magic, even the most specious. However, she is pitied by both. The reason Ceres

* Infantem—si texeris nostra secreta silentio, divinum; si profanaveris, mortalem, P. 96.

† P. 112. ‡ P. 111.

gives

gives her for not complying with her request is remarkable. She had entered, she said, into an ancient league with Venus, which she could not violate *. By which is intimated, that all the *Mysteries* had one and the same end. And Psyche, she said, had reason to thank her that she did not seize on her and detain her prisoner †; alluding to the obligation that all were under to bring to punishment the violators of the *Mysteries*.

Juno excuses herself, from imparting any assistance, "out of reverence to the Laws, which forbid any "one to entertain another's runaway servant ‡." For those who had violated the *Mysteries* of one God could not be admitted to those of another.

In this distress PSYCHE resolves at last to render herself to the offended Parties, and implore their pardon. Venus imposes on her a long and severe penance; in which the author seems to have shadowed out the trials and labours undergone by the aspirants to the *Mysteries*, and the more severe in proportion to the delinquencies of the aspirants, intimated in the words of Venus to her—Sed jam nunc ego sedulo periclitabor an oppido forti animo, singularique prudentia sis prædita §.

During the course of these trials, PSYCHE falls once more into distress by her rash curiosity ‖, and would be undone but for the divine assistance, which

* — cum qua etiam antiquum foedus amicitiæ colo. P. 111.

† quod a me retenta custoditaque non fueris optimi consule. P. 112.

‡ — tunc etiam Legibus, quæ servos alienos profugos, invitis Dominis, vetant suscipi, prohibeor. P. 112.

§ P. 118.

‖ Mente capitur TEMERARIA CURIOSITATE, p. 123.

all

all along supports and aids her in her difficulties. In which the Author hints at the promises made to the aspirants on these occasions: — Nec Providentiæ bonæ graves oculos innocentis anima latuit ærumna. In her greatest distress, in the repetition of her first capital fault, she is relieved by Cupid himself; intimating, that nothing but the divine aid can overcome human weakness; as appears from these words of Cupid to his spouse—Et ecce, inquit, *rursum* perieras misella *simili curiositate.* Sed interim quidem tu provinciam, quæ tibi matris meæ precepto mandata est, exequere gnaviter: *cetera egomet videro**. When in these trials the aspirant had done his best, the Gods would help out the rest.

With this assistance, she performs her penance, is pardoned, and restored to favour: put again into possession of DIVINE LOVE, and rewarded with IMMORTALITY, the declared end of all the MYSTERIES.

There are many other circumstances in this fine Allegory equally serving to support the system here explained: as there are others which allude to divers beautiful Platonic notions, foreign to the present discourse. It is enough that we have pointed to its chief, and peculiar purpose; which it was impossible to see while the nature and design of the whole Fable lay undiscovered.

But now perhaps it may be said, "That all this is very well. An Allegory is here found for the GOLDEN ASS, which, it must be owned, fits the Fable. But still it may be asked, Was it indeed made for it? Did the Author write the tale for the moral; or did the Critic find the moral for the tale? For an Allegory

* P. 123.

may

may be drawn from almost any story: and they have been often made for Authors who never thought of them. Nay, when a rage of allegorizing happens to prevail, as it did a century or two ago, the Author himself will be either tempted or obliged, without the Commentator, to encourage this delusion. *Ariosto* and *Tasso*, writers of the highest reputation, one of whom wrote after the *Gothic* Romances, as the other after the *Classic* Fables, without ever concerning themselves about any other moral than what the natural circumstances of the story conveyed; yet, to secure the success of their poems, they submitted, in compliance to fashion and false taste, to the ridiculous drudgery of inventing a kind of posthumous Allegory, and sometimes more than one; that the reader himself might season their Fables to his own taste." As this has been the case, To shew that I neither impose upon myself nor others, I have reserved the Author's own declaration of his having an *Allegoric meaning*, for the last confirmation of my system. It is in these words,

> At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio
> Varias Fabulas conseram, auresque tuas
> Benevolas lepido susurro permulceam;
> Modo si PAPYRUM ÆGYPTIAM ARGUTIA
> NILOTICI CALAMI INSCRIPTAM, non spreveris
> Inspicere* - - -

A direct insinuation of its being replete with the profound *Ægyptian wisdom*; of which, that Nation, by the invention of the MYSTERIES, had conveyed so considerable a part to the *Greeks*.

* In init. Fab.

Before

Before I totally dismiss this matter it may not be improper to observe, that both VIRGIL and APULEIUS have represented the genuine MYSTERIES, as Rites of perfect sanctity and purity; and recommended only such to their Countrymen; while they expose impure and impious Rites to the public execration; for it was their purpose to stigmatize the reigning corruptions, and to recommend the ancient sanctity. On the other hand, a man attached by his office to the recommendation of the *Mysteries*, as then practised, was to do the best he could, when deprived of the benefit of this distinction; and was to endeavour to give fair colours to the foulest things. This was the case of JAMBLICHUS. His friend *Porphyry* had some scruples on this head. He doubts whether those Rites could come from the Gods, which admitted such a mixture of lewdness and impurity. Such a mixture *Jamblichus* confesses; but, at the same time, endeavours to account for their divine original, by shewing, that they are only the emblems of natural Truths; or a kind of moral purgation of the inordinate passions*. You will say, he might have given a better answer; That they were *modern* abuses and corruptions. He asks your pardon for that. Such a confession would have been condemning his own Platonic fanaticism; that very fanaticism which had brought in these abominations. He was reduced therefore to the necessity of admitting that they were no after-corruptions, but coeval with the Rites themselves. And this admission of so learned a Hierophant, is, as far as I am able to collect, the only support which any one can now have for saying, that *the Mysteries were impure and abominable, even from their first Institution.*

* De Mysteriis, Sect. i. cap. xi.

Hitherto

Hitherto we have considered the Legislator's care in perpetuating the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE. And if I have been longer than ordinary on this head, my excuse is, that the topic was new *, and the doctrine itself, which is the main subject of the present inquiry, much interested in it.

A very remarkable circumstance (for which we are indebted to the observation of modern travellers) may convince us, that Rulers and Governors cultivated the belief of this doctrine with a more than common assiduity. Many barbarous nations have been discovered in these later times, on the coasts of Africa, which, in the distractions of Government, and transmigrations of People, have, it is probable, fallen from a *civilized* to a *savage* state of life. These are found to have little or no knowledge of a God, or observance of Religion. And yet, which is a surprising paradox, they still retain the settled belief and expectation of a FUTURE STATE. A wonder to be accounted for no other way than by what hath been said above of the Legislator's principal concern for the support of this

* A well-known writer, Mr. Jackson (not to speak at present of Others of a later date) who had long and scurrilously railed at the author of the D. L. in a number of miserable pamphlets, hath at length thought fit in a Thing, called Chronological Antiquities, to borrow from this book, without any acknowledgment, all he had to give the public concerning the pagan MYSTERIES; and much, concerning the HIEROGLYPHICS and origin of idolatry. But this is the common practice of such sort of writers: and is only mentioned here to shew the reader to what class they belong. The treatment these volumes have met with from some of the most worthless of my Countrymen, made me think it expedient to contrast their behaviour with that of the most learned and respectable foreign Divines and Critics of France, Germany, and Holland, in their animadversions on this Work, occasionally inserted in the notes.

Doctrine; and of the deep root, which by its agreeable nature, it takes in the Mind wherever it has been once received. So that though, as it hath been observed, *no Religion ever existed without the doctrine of a Future State*, yet the doctrine of a Future State hath, it seems, sometimes existed without a Religion.

APPENDIX

TO

BOOK II.

WE have seen with what art, and care in contrivance, the Sages of the GENTILE World endeavoured, by the intervention of the MYSTERIES, to prevent the memory of THE FIRST CAUSE of all things from being totally obliterated from the minds of men; while the perverse constitution of the National Idolatries prevented the true God's being received into any PUBLIC Worship. To the SECRET of the *Mysteries* it was, that these Pseudo-Evangelists invited their more capable Disciples, awfully admonishing them *to give heed unto it, as unto a light shining in a dark place.* For it was no more than such a glimmering, till the *rising of the day-star* of the Gospel, in the *hearts* of the Faithful.

But if the late noble Author of THE FIRST PHILOSOPHY deserves credit; all this care was as absurd as it was fruitless.

The Institutors of the *Mysteries* imparted this SECRET, as the true and only solid foundation of RELIGION; for the FIRST CAUSE was, in their ideas, a God whose ESSENCE indeed was incomprehensible, but his ATTRIBUTES, as well moral as natural, discoverable by human reason. Such a God was wanted

for that foundation: for *unassisted* reason taught *them*, as, in its most *assisted* state, it had taught St. PAUL, *That he who cometh to God, must believe that he is; and that he is a* REWARDER *of them who diligently seek him.* Thus Plato, in his *Book of Laws*, speaking of Religion, and it's use to civil Society, says, "It is "not of small consequence, that what we here reason "about the Gods, should, by all means and methods, "be made probable; as that they ARE, and that they "are GOOD *." Hence, though their mistaken *mode* of teaching, deprived the pagan world of the *fruit* of the Doctrine, the purpose however was laudable and rational.

But now comes a modern Sage †—PHILOSOPHER and STATESMAN like the Ancient, (in all things else how unlike!) who tells us "that they made the Basis of Religion far too wide; that men have no further concern with GOD than TO BELIEVE THAT HE IS, which his *physical Attributes* make fully manifest; but, That he is *a rewarder of them who diligently seek him*, Religion doth not require us to believe, since this depends on God's MORAL ATTRIBUTES, of which we have no conception." In this manner, by the turn of a hand, hath our Noble Philosopher changed *Natural Religion* into NATURALISM; and made this care of the ancient Sages as ridiculously conceived as it was ineffectually prosecuted.

But to do justice to the weak endeavours of those Friends and Servants of mankind, who surely deserve a grateful memory with Posterity, I shall take the liberty to examine his Lordship's reasoning on this

* ὡς θεόι τ' εἰσι, καὶ ἀγαθοί.

† Lord Bolingbroke.

branch

branch of his FIRST PHILOSOPHY; which casts so malignant a shade over the whole religious World.

He pretends to prove *That we have* NO ADEQUATE *ideas of God's moral attributes, his* GOODNESS *and* JUSTICE, *as we have of his natural, his Wisdom and Power.* Here let me observe, that his Lordship uses the words, *inadequate ideas*, and, *no ideas*, as terms of the same import. And I think, not improperly. I have therefore followed him in the different use of either expression. For the reason of his calling our ideas of God's *moral attributes* INADEQUATE, is, because he denies, that goodness and justice in God, and goodness and justice amongst Men, are the same IN KIND. But if not the *same in kind*, we can have NO IDEA of them; because we have no idea of any *other kind* of goodness and justice.

He lays down these three propositions:

1. That, by METAPHYSICS, or by reasoning *à priori*, we can gain no knowledge of God at all;

2. That our knowledge of his *Attributes* is to be acquired only by a contemplation on his WORKS, or by the reasoning *à posteriori*;

3. That in *this* way, we can only arrive at the knowledge of his NATURAL Attributes, not of his MORAL.

" It is from the CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD " ALONE (says his Lordship) and from the state of " mankind in it, that we can *acquire any ideas* of the " divine attributes, or a *right to affirm any thing about* " *them* *."

" The knowledge of the Creator is, on many ac- " counts, necessary to such a creature as man: and

* Vol. V. p. 331.

" therefore we are made able to arrive by a proper " exercise of our mental faculties, *from a knowledge " of God's works to a knowledge of his existence,* and " of that infinite POWER and WISDOM which are " demonstrated to us in them. OUR KNOWLEDGE " CONCERNING GOD GOES NO FURTHER *."

" Artificial Theology connects by very problematical reasoning *à priori,* MORAL ATTRIBUTES, such " as we conceive them, and such as they are relatively " to us, with the *physical attributes* of God; though " there be no sufficient foundation for this proceeding, " nay, though *the phænomena are in several cases re- " pugnant* †."

Having thus assured us that the ideas of God's *moral attributes* are to be got by no consequential reasoning at all, either *à priori* or *à posteriori*, the two only ways we have to knowledge: He rightly concludes, that if Man hath such ideas, they were not FOUND but INVENTED by him. And therefore, that nothing might be wanting to the full dilucidation of this curious point, he acquaints us who were the Authors of the FICTION, and how strangely the thing came about.

" Some of the Philosophers (says his Lordship) " having been led by a more full and accurate con- " templation of Nature to the knowledge of a supreme " self-existent Being of infinite *power and wisdom,* " and the first Cause of all things, were not contented " with this degree of knowledge. They MADE A " SYSTEM of God's MORAL as well as *physical* AT- " TRIBUTES, BY WHICH TO ACCOUNT FOR THE " PROCEEDINGS OF HIS PROVIDENCE ‡."

* Vol. IV. p. 86. † Vol. V. p. 316. ‡ Vol. IV. p. 48.

These

These Philosophers then, it seems, invented the system of God's *moral attributes*, in order to account for the difficulties arising from the view of God's *moral government*. If the World till now had been so dull as to have no conception of these Attributes; his Lordship's Philosophers, we see, made amends; who were so quick-witted to conceive, and so sharp-sighted to find out, the obliquities of a *crooked* line before they had got any idea of a *straight* one. For just to this, neither more nor less, does his Lordship's observation amount, that——*they made a System of God's moral attributes, by which to account for the proceedings of his Providence.* 'Till now, none of us could conceive how any doubts concerning *moral Government* could arise but on the previous ideas of the *moral attributes* of the *Governor*. This invention of his Lordship's old Philosophers puts me in mind of an ingenious Modern, the curious SANCHO PANCHA; who, as his historian tells us, was very inquisitive to discover the author of that very useful invention we call SLEEP: for, with this worthy Magistrate, Sleep and good Cheer were the FIRST PHILOSOPHY. Now the things sought after by Sancho and his Lordship, were at no great distance; for if *Sleeping* began when men first shut their eyes, it is certain the *idea of God's Goodness* appeared as soon as ever they opened them.

Dr. Clarke's Demonstration of the *moral attributes à priori*, I shall leave, as his Lordship is pleased to do, in all it's force. If the Doctor's followers think their Master's honour concerned, where his arguments are not, they have a large field and a safe to shew their prowess. I rather choose to undertake the NOBLE PHILOSOPHER on his own terms,

without any other arms than the arguments *à posteriori*. For he is such a Champion for the good Cause, that he not only appoints his Adversaries the Field, but prescribes to them the use of their weapons.

But his Lordship, like other great men, is not easily approached; and when he is, not always fit to be seen. You catch his FIRST PHILOSOPHY, as Butler's Hero did Aristotle's FIRST MATTER, *undressed, and without a rag of form*; however flaunting and fluttering in FRAGMENTS. To speak plainly, his Lordship's entire neglect or ignorance of Method betrays him into endless *repetitions:* and, in these, whether for want of precision in his ideas, propriety in his terms, or art in his composition, the question is perpetually changing; and rarely without being new-covered by an equivocal expression. If you add to this, the perpetual *contradictions* into which he falls, either by defect of memory, excess of passion, or distress of argument, you will allow it to be no easy matter to take him fairly, to know him fully, and to represent him to the best advantage: in none of which offices would I be willingly detective. Indeed, when you have done this, the business is over; and his Lordship's reasoning generally confutes itself.

When I reflect upon what this hath cost me, the reading over two or three bulky volumes to get possession of a single argument; which now you think you hold, and then again you lose; which meets you full when you least expect it; and slips away from you the very moment it promises to do most: when, I say, I reflect upon all this, I cannot but lament the hard luck of the *English* CLERGY, who, though apparently least fit, as being made Parties; certainly the least

concerned, as there is nothing that can impose on a Scholar, though a great deal that may mislead the People, are likely to be the men most engaged with his Lordship in this controversy. Time was, when if a Writer had a disposition to seek Objections against Religion, though he found them hardly, and urged them heavily, yet he would digest his thoughts, and methodize his reasoning. The Clergy had then nothing to do but to answer him, if they found themselves able. But since this slovenly custom (as Lord SHAFTESBURY calls it) has got amongst our Freethinkers, of *taking their physic in public*, of throwing about their loose and crude indigestions under the name of FRAGMENTS, things which in their very name imply not so much the *want*, as the *exclusion* of all *form*, the Advocate of Religion has had a fine time of it: he must work them into consistence, he must mould them into shape, before he can safely lay hold of them himself, or present them handsomely to the Public. But these Gentlemen have provided that a Clergyman should never be idle. All, he had of old to attend, was the saving the souls of those committed to his care. He must now begin his work a great deal higher; he must first convince his flock that they have souls to be saved. And the spite of all is, that at the same time his kind masters have doubled his task, they appear very well disposed to lessen his wages.

We have observed, that the DENIAL of God's *moral attributes* is the great barrier against Religion in general: but it is more especially serviceable in his Lordship's idiosyncratic terrors, the terrors of a *future State*. To these we owe his famous book of FRAGMENTS, composed occasionally, and taken as an extemporaneous cordial, each stronger than the other, to support himself

self under his frequent paroxysms. For, set the *moral attributes* aside, and we can neither form any judgement of the *end* of man, nor of the *nature* of God's government. All our knowledge will be confined to our *present* state and condition *. It is by the *moral attributes*, we learn, that man was made for *happiness:* and that God's dispensation to us *here* is but *part* of a general system: This naturally extends our views to, and terminates our knowledge in, *Futurity.*

The fate of all Religion therefore being included in the question of God's *moral attributes*, I hold it of much importance to prove against his Lordship, that MEN MAY ACQUIRE ADEQUATE IDEAS OF THEM in the same way, and with equal certainty, in which they acquire the knowledge of God's *natural attributes:* And the knowledge of these latter his Lordship deduces from its original in the following words:

" All our knowledge of God (says he) is derived " from his works. Every part of the immense Uni- " verse, and the order and harmony of the Whole, are " not only conformable to our ideas or notions of " WISDOM and POWER, but these ideas and notions " were impressed originally and principally by them, " on every attentive mind; and men were led to con- " clude, with the utmost certainty, that a Being of " infinite *wisdom* and *power* made, preserved, and go- " verned the system. As far as we can discover, we " discern these in all his works; and where we cannot " discern them, it is manifestly due to our imperfec- " tion, not to his. This now is real knowledge, or

* One of his Lordship's Corollaries therefore from the Proposition of *no moral attributes*, is this, " Our Knowledge concerning " God goes no further than for the necessary use of human life." Vol. IV. p. 486.

" there

" there is no such thing as knowledge. We acquire " it immediately in the objects themselves, in God, " and in Nature, the work of God. We know what " *wisdom* and *power* are: we know both intuitively, " and by the help of our senses, that such as we con- " ceive them to be, such they appear in the Work; " and therefore we know demonstratively that such " they are in the Worker *."

All this is mighty well: and on these very grounds I undertake to prove that men may get as clear and precise ideas of God's GOODNESS and JUSTICE.

But, to prevent, or, indeed, now things are gone thus far, rather to *redress* all ambiguity in the terms, and equivocation in the use of them; it will be proper to explain what TRUE PHILOSOPHY means by GOD'S WORKS, whether *physical* or *moral*.

Now, it means, if I am not much mistaken, that CONSTITUTION OF THINGS which God hath established, and directed to a plain and obvious end: no regard being had to those impediments or obstructions in it's course, which the Author of nature hath permitted to arise from any part of the *material*, or *intellectual* Creation.

Thus, when we consider his *physical* works, in order to make our estimate of his *wisdom* and *power*, we conceive them as they are in themselves; and in the perfection of their first constitution; though the greater portions of the *physical* system may, from the intractability of Matter, be subject to some *inconsiderable irregularities*; which, as the TRUE PHILOSOPHER † observes, *will be apt to increase till this System wants a reformation*: and though the smaller Portions of it,

* Vol. V. p. 524. † Newton.

such

such as the bodies of animals, may, from various accidents in their conception and birth, often want that convenient form in the adaption of their parts, from the wonderful contrivance of which, in the various bodies of animals in general, arises so illustrious an evidence of the *wisdom* and *power* of the Creator.

Surely then, common sense guided by equitable measure requires us to estimate God's *moral Works* on the same standard; to consider what the *moral constitution is in itself:* and (when the question is of God's *goodness* and *justice)* to keep that consideration distinct; and not suffer it to be disturbed by the view of any interruptions occasioned by the perverse influence of the passion or action of material or immaterial Beings. For, here, Both concur to violate the Constitution: In the *natural* system, man's *Free-will* hath no place: in the *moral*, the abuse of *Free-will* occasions the greatest of it's disorders.

In prosecuting this question, therefore, As, in order to acquire and confirm our ideas of God's *wisdom* and *power*, we consider the *natural system* so far forth only as it's order and harmony is supported by the *general Laws* of matter and motion; so, in order to acquire and confirm our ideas of his *goodness* and *justice*, we should regard the *moral system* so far forth only as it's order and harmony is supported by that GENERAL LAW, which annexes *happiness to virtue, and to vice, misery, and ruin.*

Thus much, and only thus much, is *God's Work* in either system: and it is from *God's Work*, he tells us, we are to demonstrate his *Attributes.* The rest (where disorders real or apparent obtrude themselves to obstruct our views in these discoveries) proceed from *Matter* and *Mind.*

And

And it is not to be forgotten, that the conclusion, Religionists draw from hence, in support of their *adequate* ideas of God's *moral* attributes, hath the greater strength upon his Lordship's own principles; who holds, that this Constitution arises *solely from the* WILL of God: For then we are sure that the WILL, which annexes happiness to virtue, and misery to vice, must arise from God's *moral* rather than from his *physical* nature.

Having premised thus much; no more, indeed, than necessary to obviate one continued SOPHISM, which runs through all his Lordship's reasonings, against the *moral attributes* (where, the *course and operation of that moral Constitution*, as it appears under the disturbances occasioned by man's free-will, is perpetually put for the *Constitution itself)* I now proceed to shew, that, from GOD'S WORKS, we have as precise ideas of his GOODNESS and JUSTICE as of his *power* and *wisdom.*

His Lordship observes, that *from every part of the immense Universe, and from the harmony of the Whole, men are led to conclude, with the utmost certainty, that a Being of infinite* WISDOM *and* POWER *made, preserved, and governed the System.* This, he observes in favour of the *natural* attributes. And what should hinder men from making the same observation in favour of the *moral*; viz. That the happiness and misery by the very constitution of nature, attendant on Virtue and on Vice, lead men to conclude, with equal certainty, that a Being of infinite GOODNESS and JUSTICE made, preserves, and governs the system?

The existence of this *moral Constitution* in the natural connexion between vice and misery, virtue and happiness, his Lordship amply acknowledges. Let us consider

consider it, therefore, both as it respects BODIES of men, and INDIVIDUALS.

That *Communities* are always happy or miserable in proportion as their Manners are virtuous or vicious, his Lordship himself is, on all occasions, ready to demonstrate. If such a Constitution of things do not bespeak the Author of it, *good* and *just*, how is it possible to conclude any thing of the character of the Creator, from his WORKS? His Lordship thinks, "that from the marks of wisdom and power in the *physical system*, we learn with the utmost certainty that God is *wise* and *powerful*; and he says, that we acquire this knowledge immediately, as it were, by our senses." Are there not the self-same marks of goodness and justice in this part at least of the *moral system*, which respects Communities? And do not we come to know as immediately by our senses, and as certainly by our reason, that God is *good* and *just*?

If we consider the *moral Constitution*, as it respects *Particulars*, we see virtue and vice have the same influence on our happiness and misery. Here, indeed, we find more interruptions, in the *means* to the *end*, than in the other part. Our material and our intellectual Natures are here of more force, to disorder the harmony of the System. In *Communities*, it can rarely be disturbed, but by a Pestilence, or that other, moral, Plague, a Hero or a Conqueror. Amongst *Particulars*, indeed, physical evil and the abuse of free-will operate more strongly: But when once the demonstration of the *moral attributes* is clearly made from that part of the Constitution which regards *Communities*, it can never afterwards be shaken by the disorders in that other part which regards *Particulars*. The established truth is now a Principle for further discoveries; and

and all we can fairly deduce from these disorders is the CERTAINTY of a *future State*. But this by the way.

What I insist upon at present is, that, to decide the question concerning God's *Attributes*, we are to consider the Constitution of things, as it is in itself. This is, properly, *God's Work*. The disorders in it, occasioned by the abuse of man's *free-will*, is not his work, but man's. This, his Lordship too, upon another occasion, namely, when he combats the argument of a *future state*, from an unequal Providence, is perpetually repeating. So that these disorders must, even on his Lordship's own principles, be excluded from the account, when we estimate God's Nature and *Attributes*, from his *Works*.

"But we see not those disorders in the *natural* world, which we both see and feel in the *moral*." This would be some objection, did God in the *moral*, as in the *natural* system, direct immediately, or constitute things mechanically; or had Free-will the same influence on the *natural* as on the *moral* system. — Did God direct, immediately or mechanically in both Constitutions, or did he direct immediately and mechanically in neither, and that yet the *moral* remained more subject to disorder than the *natural*, it might indeed follow that we had not so clear ideas of God's *goodness* and *justice* as of his *wisdom* and *power*: But since he has thought fit to leave man, FREE; and hath been pleased to suffer the abuse of free-will to affect the *moral* system, and not the *natural*; as this, I say, is the case, the greater irregularities in the *one* do not take off from the equal clearness of the demonstration, which results from the nature of *both one and the other* Constitution. This difference is not to be ascribed to a

contrary

contrary conduct in the Governor of the two Systems, but to the contrary natures of the Subjects. Passive matter being totally inert, it's resistance to the Laws impressed upon it, must be extremely weak: and consequently the disorders arising from that resistance, proportionably slow and unheeded: while that active self-moving principle, the Mind, flies out at once from the centre of its direction, and can every moment deflect from the line of truth and equity. Hence moral disorders began early, became excessive, and have continued, through all ages, to disturb the harmony of the System.

What is here said will, I suppose, be sufficient to confute the following assertions; and to detect the mistake on which they arise.

" Every thing (says his Lordship) shews the *wisdom* " and *power* of God conformably to our ideas of " wisdom and power in the *physical* world and in the " *moral. But every thing does not shew in like man-* " *ner the* justice *and* goodness *conformably to our* " *ideas of these attributes in either. The physical* " *attributes are in their nature more glaring and less* " *equivocal**."

And again; " There is *no sufficient foundation* in " the phænomena of Nature to connect the moral " attributes with the physical attributes of God. *Nay,* " *the phnæomena are in several cases repugnant* †."

But since he goes so far as to talk of the *want of a foundation,* and even a *repugnancy*; Before I proceed with the main branch of my reasoning, I will just urge one single argument for the reality and full evidence of the *moral attributes:* and it shall be taken

* Vol. V. p. 524. † Vol. V. p. 316.

from

from his own concessions, and shall conclude on his own principles.

He tells us, that such as he, "who apply themselves to the *first Philosophy*, apply themselves to "the noblest objects that can demand the attention "of the mind—To the signification of GOD'S WILL, "concerning the duties we owe to him, and to one "another*."

And again, "It is sufficient to establish our *moral* "obligations that we consider them relatively to our "own system. From thence they arise: and since "they arise from thence, it must be the WILL of that "Being who made the system, that we should observe and practise them †."

Let me ask then, Whence it is that we collect this WILL from the objects which his Lordship allows us to contemplate, namely, his WORKS *in this system?* He will say from certain *qualities* in those objects—What are those qualities? He will reply, the *fitnesses* of means to ends.——Who was the Author of these fitnesses? He hath told us, the *God of nature*——It was God's *will* then, that we should use the *means*, in order to obtain the *ends*. Now, in the moral System, the means are virtuous practice; the end, happiness. Virtue therefore must needs be pleasing to him; and Vice, as its contrary, displeasing. Well, but then, as to this approbation and dislike; it must be either capricious, or it must be regulated on the nature of things. *Wisdom*, which his Lordship condescends to give his Maker, will not allow us to suppose it capricious. It is regulated therefore on the nature of things: But if the *nature of things* be, as his Lord-

* Vol. V. p. 447. † Vol. V. p. 452.

ship holds it is, the *constitution of God*, and dependent on his *will*, then he who is pleased with virtue, and displeased with vice, must needs be himself *good* and *just*.

To proceed now with the principal branch of our reasoning. His Lordship goes on thus: *But men not only might collect God's natural attributes from the physical system, but in effect they did; and all men, at all times, had these notions so strongly impressed on them, that they were led to conclude with the utmost certainty for a Being of infinite power and wisdom.*

I desire to know in what time or place it ever happened, before his Lordship philosophised at Battersea, *and could find no foundation, in the phænomena of nature, to connect the moral with the physical attributes of God*, that a Man, who believed God's infinite wisdom and power, did not with equal confidence believe his infinite goodness and justice? In truth, these two sets of ideas, the *physical* and *moral* attributes of the Deity, were equally extensive, they were equally steddy, and, till now, they were always inseparable.

He says, that *as far as we can discover, we discern infinite wisdom and power in all God's works: and where we cannot discern them, it is manifestly due to our imperfection, not to his.*

What his Lordship here says will deserve to be considered. A comparison is insinuated between our discovery of infinite power and wisdom from the *physical* works of God; and our discovery of infinite goodness and justice from his *moral* works; in which, the advantage is given to the former. Now, in order to come to a just decision in this point (omitting at present the notice of his general Sophism, which ope-

rates

rates in this observation, as in the rest) we must distinguish between the *means of acquiring* the knowledge of God's Attributes, and that *knowledge when acquired.*

As to the first (the *means of acquiring*) there seems to be some advantage on the side of God's PHYSICAL works. For, as his Lordship rightly observes, *where we cannot discern wisdom and power in the physical works, it is due to our imperfection, not to his: for as men advance in the knowledge of nature, we see more and more of wisdom and power.* And he insinuates, we cannot say the same concerning the difficulties in the *moral* system. It is true, we cannot. But then let me tell him, neither can we say the contrary. The reason is, The physical system lies open to our enquiries; and by the right application of our senses to well-tried experiments, we are able to make considerable advances in the knowledge of Nature. It is not so in the *moral* system; all we know here are a few general principles concerning its Constitution; and further than this, human wit or industry is unable to penetrate. These general principles are, indeed, amply sufficient to deduce and establish the *moral attributes* from the *moral system*; but not sufficient to remove all difficulties that arise from what we see of the actual administration of that System. So that, though *we* cannot say, that *as we advance in the knowledge* of the moral system *we see more and more of goodness and justness*; So neither can *his Lordship* say (though his words seem to insinuate he could) that as we advance, we see *less and less.* Whereas the truth is, beyond those general principles, we cannot advance at all.

But then, as to the second part in the distinction (the *knowledge of the attributes, when acquired)* I hold the advantage, and a great one it is, lies altogether on the side of the MORAL. And thus I argue: Though the idea of God's *natural* attributes be as clear in the abstract, as that of his *moral*, yet the idea of his moral attributes is, in the concrete, more adequate than that of his natural. The reason seems convincing. The moral relation in which we stand to God, as free agents, is just the same whether man exists alone, or whether he be but a link in the chain of innumerable orders of intelligences surrounding the whole Creation. Hence we must needs have a full knowledge of our duty to him, and of his disposition towards us: on which knowledge is founded the exactness of our conceptions of his moral attributes, his *justice* and *goodness*. But the natural relation in which we, or any of God's creatures, stand towards him, as material Beings, is not the same when considered simply, as when considered to be a portion of a dependent and connected Whole. Because, whenever such a Whole exists, the harmony and perfection of it must first of all be consulted. This harmony ariseth from the mutual subserviency and union of its parts. But this subserviency may require a ministration of government, with regard to certain portions of Matter thus allied, different from what might have followed had those portions stood alone, because that precise disposition, which might be fit in one case, might be unfit in the other. Hence we, who know there is a Whole, of which our material system is a Part; and yet are totally ignorant both of its nature and extent, can have but a very confused idea of that physical relation in which we stand towards God: so that our conceptions

conceptions of his *natural* attributes, his *power* and *wisdom*, which are founded on that idea, must in the concrete be proportionably vague and inadequate.

But it may be asked, perhaps, Whence arises this reciprocal advantage which the *moral* and the *natural* attributes have over one another, in the *means of acquiring* the knowledge of the *Attributes*, and the precision of *that knowledge when acquired?* I will tell the Reader in two words. Of *our own physical* system, we know many particulars (that is, we discover much of the *means*, but nothing of the *end)*; and of the *universal* physical system we are entirely ignorant. On the other hand, we know but few particulars of *our own moral* system (that is, we discover only the *end*, and not the *means)*; and of the *universal* moral system we understand the general principles.

His Lordship proceeds. *This now* [the knowlege of God's *natural* attributes] *is real knowledge*; *or there is no such thing as knowledge. We acquire it immediately in the objects themselves*, IN GOD, *and in nature the work of God.*

What his Lordship means by, *in God*, in distinction from the *work of God*, I confess I do not understand: Perhaps it may be intended to insinuate, in honour of the *natural attributes*, that they may be even proved *à priori*; for this is not the first time by many, when, after having heartily abused a thing or person, he has been reduced to support himself on the authority, or the reasoning they afford him. Or perhaps, it was only used to round the period, and set off his eloquence. However, I agree with him, that this is *real knowledge*. And so too, I think, is the knowledge of the *moral* attributes, so gained. Why truly, says his Lordship, *I do allow just so much goodness and justicē in God as*

we see in that CONSTITUTION, *which annexes happiness to virtue, and misery to vice. But this,* says he, *I think, had better be called* WISDOM. I think so too, if by *so much,* he means no more than what concerns God's *natural Government:* and that he means no more is plain from his making the *natural* consequence of vice and virtue the only sanction of the moral Law. But I will venture to go further, and say, that, from what we see in this *Constitution,* we may collect PERFECT GOODNESS AND JUSTICE. *Matter* and man's *free-will* disturb the System: But if the *constitution* be the effect of God's *will,* as his Lordship holds it is; and the mark of his *wisdom,* as all Mankind hold with him; Does not that *wisdom* require that his *will* should not be defeated? Would it not be defeated, if the disorders occasioned by the perversity of his creatures were not remedied and set right? And is not A REMEDY the clearest mark of *perfect goodness* and *justice?*

Take it in another light. Free-will crosses that *Constitution,* which God, by establishing, shews he intended should take place. This *present* disturbance could not have been prevented, because, according to my Lord and his ill-used Poet, it was necessary to the schemes of divine wisdom, that there should be such a creature as MAN:

" For in the scale of reasoning life 'tis plain
" There must be, somewhere, such a rank as man.

The consequence is, that the disorder will be *hereafter* rectified.

Had Man indeed been made *unnecessarily;* and had this Man broke in upon God's general System, his Lordship might have had some pretence to say, as he does, that GOD MEANT THE SYSTEM SHOULD NOT

BE

BE FURTHER PURSUED; that is, that the scheme which annexes happiness to virtue, and misery to vice, should remain in its present condition of an incomplete Dispensation, to all eternity. But since Man is acknowledged to be a *necessary* part of a general System, complete in all its Members, it is nonsense to talk of *God's not meaning the particular System should be further pursued*, when that *further pursuit* is only to bring it to its natural period; short of which, it would remain unfinished, nay, unformed.

He goes on. *We know what* WISDOM *and* POWER *are. We know both intuitively, and by the help of our senses, that such as we conceive them to be, such they appear in the* WORK; *and therefore we know demonstratively that such they are in the* WORKER.

And do we not know what GOODNESS and JUSTICE are? And by the very same means? Do we not *intuitively*, and by the *help of our senses know*, that such as we conceive them to be, such they appear in the WORK, namely, in that *constitution of things*, which, his Lordship tells us, annexes happiness to virtue, and misery to vice? And may we not *demonstratively* collect from thence that such they are in the WORKER? since this *Constitution*, his Lordship tells us again, is the effect of God's WILL. On his own principles, therefore, applied to his own state of the reasoning *à posteriori*, it appears, that God is of *infinite goodness* and *justice*, as well as of *infinite wisdom* and *power*.

But to give AUTHORITY to his partial reasoning (the usual support of all partialities), he makes *Anaxagoras* instruct us, what we are to think of this matter. "Should you ask *Anaxagoras* (says he) "what *goodness* is, or *justice?* He might bid you,

" perhaps, turn your eyes inward, first; then, survey " mankind; observe the wants of individuals, the " benefits of society, and, from these particulars, frame " the general notions of *goodness* and *justice*. He " might go a step further: and add, this is *human* " goodness and *human* justice, such as we can com- " prehend, such as we can exercise, and such as the " supreme mind has made it both our duty and interest " to exercise, by the constitution of the human system, " and by the relations which arise in it: from all which " our notions of *goodness* and *justice* result, and are " compounded."

We know then, according to our mock Anaxagoras, what *goodness* and *justice* are, as certainly as what *Wisdom* and *Power* are: Since this quaternion of Attributes are all known by the same means and by no other: *we know both intuitively and by the help of our senses, that such as we conceive them to be, such they appear in the work.* For he bids us *turn our eyes inward*; then *survey mankind*; and lastly, observe how *reason*, from the *constitution of human nature*, confirms our *intuitive* knowledge, and that which we gain by the *help of our senses*.—But what does all this signify, if *Anaxagoras* or his Lordship be in an humour of concluding against their own premisses? Hear then how the speech ends—" Of *divine goodness* and divine " justice, might this Philosopher conclude, I AM " UNABLE TO FRAME ANY ADEQUATE NOTIONS*." What? Unable to *frame* those notions which God, by his *moral Constitution*, has put into our hands; and by the declaration of his WILL has taught us to *apply*? Yes, he bids us conclude, that we are *unable to frame any adequate notion of divine* GOODNESS *and* JUSTICE,

* Vol. IV. p. 116, 117.

and

and yet, on the force of the very same reasoning, to conclude as steddily, that we are *able to frame an adequate notion of divine* WISDOM *and* POWER.—This old *Philosopher*, I suppose, was not brought in to be laughed at, like his drunken Church-HELOTES*; yet, he plays the fool to admiration.—*We* DO KNOW, says Anaxagoras, *what* Goodness *and* Justice *are: we know both intuitively, and by the help of our senses, that such as we conceive them to be, such they appear in the* WORK; *and* THEREFORE *we* DO NOT KNOW *that such they are in the* WORKER.

Might I be permitted to address myself to this Renegado Sophist, I would say,—Your brethren, the ancient Philosophers, reasoned *à posteriori* in this manner, "Can you think there is *wisdom* and *power* in you, and none in your Maker?"—By no means. They reasoned well.—Let me ask you then, is there *goodness* and *justice* in you, and none in your Maker?" His answer, I suppose, would be the same. But, prompted by his Lordship, into whose service he is now entered, he adds, That, from *human goodness* and *justice* we cannot come to the NATURE of the *divine*. What should hinder us, I pray you? Is it not from our *intuitive conception* of our own *wisdom* and *power* that we gain an adequate idea of God's? Are *wisdom* and *power* MORE PERFECT, as they are found in man, than *goodness* and *justice?* If therefore the IMPERFECTION of these attributes in Man hinder our acquiring an adequate idea of those in God, we can have no adequate

* — "far be it from me to wish (says his Lordship) that the "race of Metaphysicians and Casuists should increase. But since "there will be such men, it is very reasonable to wish that they "may serve to the same good purpose that the Helotes, the "drunken slaves, did at Sparta," &c. Vol. V. p. 446.

idea

idea of his *wisdom* and *power:* If the IMPERFECTION does not hinder, then we may have an adequate idea of his *goodness* and *justice.*

But, the inference to God's *power* and *wisdom*, his Lordship says, is supported by what men see of the effects of them, in his Works; the order and harmony of the *physical* System. Do we not see likewise the effects of God's *goodness* and *justice*, in the order and harmony of the *moral*, in the happiness that naturally attends virtue, and the misery consequent on vice? And is not the *moral* System as much *God's Work*, as the *physical?*

Thus, we see, that by the very reasoning, his Lordship EMPLOYS to prove the *natural* attributes, and by the very method he PRESCRIBES to us for proving the *moral* attributes, we have demonstrated the *moral* with a precision and a certainty, at least equal to the *natural.* His Lordship seems to have been aware of the event; and therefore when he had set us at defiance, he tried to put the change upon us, under pretence of reminding us, that the *moral attributes* should be examined by, or *applied to*, THE CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD AND THE STATE OF MANKIND IN IT*. I had full as much reason to be aware of his Lordship. And therefore in stating the question, at my entrance on the subject, I obviated this miserable Sophism. I call it by no better name, because it is not *the constitution of the world or the state of mankind in it*, but the CONSTITUTION OF THE MORAL SYSTEM, or the nature of Virtue and Vice as they naturally operate to produce happiness and misery, by which God's *moral attributes* are to be tried and ascertained. But this, which, by a steddy light, gives us an uniform view, he would

* Vol. V. p. 331.

have

have us turn from; to contemplate that obscure, disturbed, and shifting scene, the actual state of vice and virtue, of misery and happiness, amongst men. That is, he would have us conclude concerning God's nature, not from his VOLUNTARY CONSTITUTION of things, but from the BREACHES in that Constitution made by the abuse of man's free-will: which yet (when he is arguing *for an equal providence)* he again and again confesses ought not to be charged upon God; and declaims violently against the folly of those who impute the effects of that abuse to him. Though here (in his various attempts to blot out *the idea of God's moral attributes)* he be full of the disorders of the moral System, considered as part of God's design.

But since I have mentioned his arguments for an *equal providence*, I should be unjust to my argument, if I concealed from the Reader, another of his contradictions.—He had Man's *future State* as well as *God's moral attributes* to throw out of the religious World; or, to speak more properly, he had RELIGION to overturn, by taking away its very ESSENCE; and as the *irregularities* in the present administration of God's moral Providence stood in the way of his first attempt; and the *consistency* of the *moral System itself* in the way of the other; when he argues against a FUTURE STATE, You would think there were no *irregularities*; and when he argues against the MORAL ATTRIBUTES, You would think there was no *consistency.*

We now come to his Lordship's particular objections against the *moral attributes.* One of them is that they are BOUNDED.

" They [the Divines] go further. As God is per-
" fect, and man very imperfect, they talk of his *infi-*
" *nite*

" *nite goodness* and *justice*, as of his infinite wisdom " and power; though the latter may preserve their " nature without any conceivable bounds, and the " former must cease to be what they are, unless we " conceive them BOUNDED. Their nature implies " necessarily a limitation in the exercise of them. " Thus then the *moral attributes*, according to this " Theology, requires infinitely more of God to man " than men are able, or would be obliged if they were " able, to exercise to one another: greater profusion " in bestowing benefits and rewards, greater rigour in " punishing offences *."

You have here his Lordship's own words; and nothing less could induce any one to think so disadvantageously of this Philosopher of the first head, as they necessarily imply. Let us consider the *premisses*, and examine the *inferences* both *implied* and *expressed*.

He says, 1. That the *moral attributes are bounded*; 2. That the *natural are not bounded*. Let us see to what the first proposition amounts; and how much truth there is in the second.

1. The *moral attributes* are considered by us as relative to *intelligent* creatures: The *natural* are not so considered. Thus, the goodness and justice when relative to man, are greatly *bounded*; a certain low degree of reward suffices for his *good*; a certain low degree of punishment for his *evil* actions. Let God's goodness and justice respect a higher rank of intelligent Beings, and they will be then *less bounded*; for greater rewards and punishments will be required;

* Vol. V. p. 528.

and

and so on, to the highest rank of intelligent creatures. Yet as the highest is at infinite distance from the Creator, the exercise of the moral attributes, as they bear relation to his intelligent creatures, must be still *bounded.*

2. His second proposition is, that *the natural attributes are not bounded.* It is true, these cannot be considered as relative to God's *intelligent* creatures; yet since, in their exercise, they must be considered as relative to his Creation at large; and since Creation, however immense, is not infinite, the natural attributes so considered are not infinite: but if not infinite, they are *bounded.* There is no difference therefore, in *the exercise* of God's attributes, between the *moral* and the *natural,* save only in the degree.

But if we consider God's *moral* and *natural* attributes more abstractedly, not as they are *in the exercise,* and relative to intelligent Beings, and to actual Creation, but as they are in his nature, then they are both *unbounded.* Thus we see his Lordship's notable distinction is both imaginary and useless.

However, let us give him all he asks; and then see what he will be able to infer from it.

1. His first *inference* seems to be this: "As the moral attributes are bounded, and not infinite like the natural, our idea of them must be *obscure* and *inadequate.*" What! because they are better adapted to human contemplation? as things *bounded* certainly are better adapted than things *infinite.* Our idea of such of God's attributes as bear relation to a Being, whose nature and properties we know, namely MAN, must needs be more adequate and better defined than the

idea

idea of such attributes as bear relation to Beings, whose nature and properties we know not, namely the gross of those which make up the UNIVERSE.

2. His other *inference*, is expressed in these words: *Thus then the moral attributes, according to this Theology, require infinitely more of God to man than men are able, or would be obliged if they were able, to exercise to one another.* To say, the moral attributes, according to Christian Theology, or, as he is pleased to call it, *artificial Theology*, requires INFINITELY *more*, is an extravagant hyperbole. To say, it *requires more*, is true. And for this plain reason: the relation between Creator and Creature is much more intimate than that, between Fellow-creatures; therefore the divine *goodness* is more abundant: The relation between Lord and Servant is more appropriate than that between Fellow-servants; therefore the divine *justice* is more severe. And had it not been deemed too presuming to refer his Lordship to Scripture for instruction (especially in a matter where the abuse of Scripture was chiefly intended) I might there have pointed to a *Parable* which would have set him right: and has always kept *artificial Theology*, whatever he might think, from going wrong. But *infinite*, when applied to the *exercise* of a moral attribute in reference to Man, is his Lordship's nonsense, with due reverence be it spoken, not the *nonsense of artificial Divines*. They were not ignorant, that the rule *infirmiorem vel deteriorem partem sequitur consequentia*, held as well in *Morals* as in *Logic*. Though God be infinite, man is finite; and therefore, with respect to man, the exertion of a *moral* attribute is finite, not infinite. His Lordship himself saw some-

thing of this, as appears by his own words. *The nature of the moral attributes implies necessarily a limitation in the use of them.* And why would he suppose, Divines could not see as far into this matter as himself?

But if there be an error in *artificial Theology*, he is as sure, at one time or other, to espouse it; as he is ready at all times to calumniate the Divine who holds it. Men, in their ill-advised zeal to defend the Scripture doctrine of the Son's Divinity, were not always sufficiently careful in selecting their arguments. Amongst such as had perhaps been better let alone, they employed this; That as man's offence was against an infinite Being, it required an infinite satisfaction; which none but such a Being could give. Now his Lordship, we see, espouses this very principle to discredit God's moral attributes, and the *artificial Theology* of Jesus Christ; which speaks, indeed, of *infinite* rewards; but not as matter of *due*, but of *grace*.

As the being *bounded* is one of his Lordship's objections against the moral attributes, so the being merely HUMAN, is another.

" After Dr. CLARKE (says he) has repeated over " and over, that all the *moral attributes* are the same " in God as in our ideas; and that he, who denies " them to be so, may as well deny the divine *physical* " *attributes*, the Doctor insists only on two of the " former, on those of *justice* and *goodness*. He was " much in the right to contract the generality of his " assertion. The absurdity of ascribing TEMPE- " RANCE, for instance, or FORTITUDE, to God, would " have been too gross, and too visible even to eyes " that prejudice had blinded the most. But that, of " ascribing

" ascribing *justice* and *goodness* to him, according to " our notions of them, might be better covered, and " was enough for his purpose, THOUGH NOT LESS " REALLY ABSURD *."

Which shall we most admire: His *Knowledge* or his *Ingenuity?* Or shall we follow the advice of his own Motto †, and *Wonder at nothing?*

When men contemplate what they call, moral virtue, or the attributes of Humanity, they divide them into two classes, perfectly distinct from one another. In the first are comprized those which belong to man under the idea of a free intelligent Being, such as *goodness* and *justice:* in the second, those which belong to him under the idea of a creature of his own frail species, such as *temperance* and *fortitude.* The first belong to all free intelligent Beings; the latter, only to such a Being as man: *Those* arise out of the nature of free intelligence, and so are common to all: *These,* from the imperfections of a very inferior creature, and so are peculiar to Humanity; for we easily conceive a higher Order of free created Intelligences, in which the moral virtues of the second class have no place. They are superior to the impressions of fear, and so have no room to exert *fortitude:* They are removed from the temptation of excess, and so have no need to exercise *temperance.* Now when CLARKE, after other Divines, had said that *the moral attributes are the same in God as in our ideas,* What Attributes could they possibly mean but those of the *first class*; those which belong to Beings under the idea of free Intelligences? STUPID as his Lordship is pleased to make Divines, they could never *blunder* at

* Vol. V. p. 311. † Nil admirari.

such

such a rate as to conceive, that those virtues or *moral attributes*, which proceed from the *imperfection* of the Creature, might belong in any manner to the Creator, whom they supposed to be *all perfect*. They held, with his Lordship, and they will hold without him, that the great God is *infinitely* wise and powerful. Were they then in any danger to give him *temperance*, which implied his being obnoxious to *folly*; or *fortitude*, which argued *impuissance?* Infinite wisdom, therefore, and infinite power, exclude from God the very ideas of *temperance* and *fortitude*. But do infinite wisdom and infinite power exclude from God the ideas of *goodness* and *justice?* On the contrary, his Lordship, as we shall see presently, is reduced to the poor shift of owning *goodness* and *justice* to be contained in infinite *wisdom* and *power*; after he had said, as here he does, *That the ascribing goodness and justice to God is* NO LESS REALLY ABSURD *than the ascribing temperance and fortitude to him.*

— But CLARKE *contracted the generality of the assertion to serve a purpose.* I think he did: and for one of the best *purposes* in the world, that of COMMON SENSE. Had his Lordship been pleased to *contract* himself on the same principle, he might have passed, perhaps, for a greater Philosopher; though he had certainly been a less Writer.

But then, if you ask, *What purpose* his Lordship had *to serve*, when he used the equivocal word ALL, (which may signify either *all* of one kind, or *all* of every kind) where he observes, Clarke holds, *that* ALL *the moral attributes are the same in God*, &c.? I answer, it was to give himself the poor pretence to say, that Clarke afterwards *contracted his generality*, or, in other words, that he contradicted himself.

A third objection against the *moral attributes* is, "That PASSIONS and AFFECTIONS mix with our goodness and justice; which therefore cannot be supposed to be *the same in kind* with GOD's; though our wisdom and power, with which no passions or affections mix, must be the *same in kind* with his."

Were passion and affection *inseparable* from human goodness and justice, the objection might seem to have some force; indeed, not much even then. But how miserable must the objection appear to those who see, as all men may, that they are *separable?* Separable, I mean, in practice as well as speculation: (Of which we have at present* one great Example at least, in a high Tribunal where they shine the most.) So that the true idea even of human goodness and justice excludes all passion and affection. What hinders then our rising, from that idea, to Divine goodness and justice, any more than our rising, from the idea of human wisdom and power, to the Divine wisdom and power; and from perceiving, that as well the *moral*, as the *natural* attributes, are the same in kind, both in God and man?

But this is not all that may be fairly said in favour of our adequate idea of God's *moral attributes*, when compared with the *natural*. For though PASSION mixes not with the human attributes of wisdom and power, yet something else does, much more difficult to be separated than *passion*, from the human attributes of goodness and justice, I mean the INSTRUMENTALITY OF MATTER. We can conceive nothing of *human power* without the use of such an instrument: yet this, by his Lordship's own confession, does not hinder us from rising from the idea of our own

* 1765.

wisdom

wisdom and power, to the wisdom and power of God; nor from seeing that they are the same *in kind.* Why then should the other foreign combination hinder us from seeing that goodness and justice are the same *in kind?*

Still, further. The MANNER *of knowing* in God, on which depends his natural attribute of WISDOM, is confessedly different from what it is in man; and, at the same time, is a thing of which we have no conception: yet this, according to his Lordship's account, does not hinder our attaining to an adequate idea of *divine wisdom,* though it rises only from what we see of the *human.*

How happens it then, that, in both these cases, notwithstanding the foreign mixture of the *instrumentality of matter,* and the *manner of knowing,* we attain an adequate idea of God's wisdom and power? His Lordship will tell you, it is by separating what is foreign, from what is native to the ideas of wisdom and power. And shall not I have as much credit with my Reader, when I tell him, we acquire an adequate idea of God's goodness and justice, by separating from the idea of human goodness and justice the foreign mixture of *passion* and *affection?*

But his Lordship has a greater quarrel than all this, with the MORAL ATTRIBUTES. They give rise to embarrassed questions, dishonourable to God, and mischievous to Religion.

" As they [the Divines] modeled God's government
" on a human plan, so they conceived his perfections,
" *moral* as well as physical, by human ideas.—Thus
" God was said to be the FIRST GOOD: but then the
" general notion or abstract idea of this *good* was not
" only taken from human goodness, but was considered

" too with little or no other relation than to man—
" A question arose therefore on these hypotheses,
" *How could evil come into a system of which God was*
" *the author?*—this question made a further hypo-
" thesis necessary; another first God, another co-
" eternal and coequal principle, was introduced to
" solve it; *a first cause of all evil*, as the other
" was *of all good**."

The false representation of this fact I reserve for another occasion: the false inference from it is what I now propose to consider.

His Lordship supposes, that the notion of God's *moral attributes* gave birth to an insoluble question concerning *the origin of evil*; and that this occasioned the invention of the mischievous hypothesis of the *two Principles*. Who would have suspected all this evil to arise from the FIRST GOOD! Yet so it was: And therefore the notion of such a GOOD must be *false*; or at least, very *hurtful*.

I. As to the first, if his Lordship's inference be right, it will unsettle all useful knowledge; because there is no great principle, either in *physics*, or in *natural Theology*, but which, if we be not on our guard, and wise enough to stop at the extent of our ideas, will lead us into inextricable difficulties: As one might instance in a point that arises out of both the sciences, physics and morals together—*The agreement between free-will and prescience*. This is a well-known case: And as his Lordship pretends to untie this knot, which hath so long kept the learned world intangled, let us examine his great talents on what is worthy of them.
" Our ideas (says he) of divine intelligence and wisdom

* Vol. IV. p. 88.

" may

" may be neither *fantastical* nor *false*, and yet God's " MANNER of knowing may be so different from ours, " that fore-knowledge, as we call it *improperly in him*, " may be consistent with the contingency of events; " although that which we call *properly* fore-knowledge " *in ourselves*, be not so *."

I have two or three remarks to make on these words.

1. Our ideas of God's moral attributes, his *goodness* and *justice*, he makes *fantastical* and *false*, on account of difficulties arising from them: yet God's natural attributes, his *intelligence* and *wisdom*, *may*, he says, *be neither fantastical nor false*, though a difficulty as great arises from them; namely, the apparent discordancy between free-will and prescience.

2. My second remark is, that his solution is more *fantastic* and *false* than the wildest chimera of School-metaphysics. The difficulty in reconciling God's prescience to man's free-will does not arise from our ignorance in God's MANNER OF KNOWING, but from God's ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE.

3. My third remark is, that his Lordship, who is here so penetrating, that he can easily reconcile *prescience* and *free-will*, is yet, in another place, so cloudy, that he cannot see how an " *equal providence* and " *free agency* may stand together †."

4. My last remark is (and it rises out of the foregoing) that where Religion is not concerned, his Lord-

* Vol. V. p. 525.

† See my observations on this Proposed difficulty in the Appendix to the Fifth Book of the Divine Legation.

ship sees no difficulty in any part of the system of Creation: But as soon as ever Religion appears, then difficulties start up by dozens. Of this, take an instance from, as it will lead us back to, the case in hand. Our ideas of God's *moral attributes*, he says, must needs be false, because the conceiving of them by human goodness and justice raises up the question of the *origin of evil*, considered *morally*. Well. And does not the conceiving of God's *physical attributes*, by human wisdom and power, lead to the question of the *origin of evil*, considered *naturally?* Yet our ideas of the physical attributes are neither *false nor fantastical*. But to this, his Lordship replies, Evil, considered *naturally*, is not real, but apparent only. Why so? Because it contributes to the greater good of the whole. May not the same thing be said of Evil, considered *morally?* Nay, hath it not been actually said, and proved too, on the same principles? It follows then, that they are either both *real*, or both *fantastic*.

In a word, the truth is no more than this, Presumptuous man knows not where to stop: he would penetrate even to the Arcana of the Godhead:

"For Fools rush in, where Angels fear to tread."

And this impious humour it was which gave birth to the absurd hypothesis of TWO PRINCIPLES. But is the folly to be charged upon our idea of the *moral attributes?* Ridiculous! We see it's *cause* is in vanity and self-conceit: passions that operate alike on all Systems; and find materials to gratify their extravagance, equally in the *physical* as in the *moral* attributes of the Deity.

II. As

II. As to his Lordship's second inference, that *this* idea is at least productive of much *mischief*, and therefore it would be better to have none at all; Let me observe, that the idea of God's very existence is productive of much mischief, even all the mischiefs of Superstition. Is it therefore better to be without a God? Who besides his Lordship would say so*? Why then should we think it better to be without the idea of the *moral attributes*, even though the evils it produced were *necessary?* But that is not the case. They are *casual* only: the issue of pride and presumption; which the idea of the *moral attributes* does not at all influence.

III. HOWEVER, these, if not hurtful, are USELESS; and this is his next cavil. "Infinite *wisdom* and "*power* (says his Lordship) have made things as they "are: how *goodness* and *justice* required they should "be made is neither *coram judice*, nor to any rational "purpose to enquire†." To inquire how the *universe of things should be made*, which refers to God's *power* and *wisdom*, serves indeed to *no reasonable purpose*. But to inquire concerning our own state and condition in this Universe, which refers to God's *goodness* and *justice*, is either *coram judice*, or we were sent into the world to no purpose. His Lordship's sophistry seems to confound two things that plain sense hath always distinguished; viz. *our own business from other men's*. When the King holds a Session of justice, 'tis not for every Particular to

* He indeed says, *he had rather be an Atheist than acknowledge the Christian Theology*; and we may believe him. See vol. iv. p. 34.

† Vol. V. p. 363.

inquire into all his measures; but every Particular, who is summoned to attend the Court, is much concerned to know how he himself shall be dealt with. His Lordship, indeed, is ready to say, We are not *summoned*; that is, we are not *accountable creatures.* But this is begging the question.

Again, to *inquire*, much more to prescribe, *how things should be made*, in any particular System, has all the folly, presumption, and impiety, which his Lordship charges upon it: Because the Parts having a relation to the Whole, an all-wise Architect makes them in conformity to that Whole, of which, we know nothing; and therefore our only conclusion should be, that the Part we do know, is constituted for the best. But it is another thing to say (which is all that Divines have said, how differently soever his Lordship is pleased to represent the matter) that God will act equitably with his rational Creation, by distributing good and evil to them according to their deserts; because this does not depend upon any Whole, of which we know nothing, but on his attributes of goodness and justice, of which, we know enough to determine with certainty concerning his final dealing with every rank of free and reasonable Beings. In this case to pass our judgment is so far from folly or impiety, that not to do it would be stupidity or hypocrisy. To call this proceeding, as his Lordship does, the patching or botching up one System with another, is a gross misrepresentation.

At length, he ends just where he set out, That we have no ideas of the moral attributes at all. "Upon the whole matter (says he) we may conclude "safely from error, and in direct opposition to "Clarke, that *goodness and justice in God cannot*

" *be conceived, without manifest presumption and im-*
" *piety, to be the same as in the ideas we frame of*
" *these perfections when we consider them in men, or*
" *when we reason about them abstractedly in them-*
" *selves*; but that in the supreme Governor of the
" World they are something TRANSCENDENT, and of
" which we cannot make any true judgment, nor
" argue with any certainty about them *." It was for jargon like this that a famous Schoolman got the name of the TRANSCENDENT DOCTOR. Yet he assures us that he is justified by the authority of St. PAUL and Dr. BARROW. *These two great Divines* (says he) *are on my side* †. Two noble supporters, (it must be confessed) to his Lordship's Atchievements! One thing I have observed, which may be worth reflecting on—A strange propensity in FREE-THINKERS to mistake their enemies for their friends, and as strange a propensity in the CLERGY to mistake their friends for their enemies. This different turn is odd enough: and, at first view, seems a little mysterious; when, perhaps, there may be no more in it than this—Free-thinkers have invented the trick, to amuse the Clergy, in order to raise their suspicions, and excite their jealousy against their best Friends: And, unhappily, the Clergy have, now and then, fallen into the snare.

But, after all, who would expect that *the leather-dressing Pontiff* ‡ of all men should have been thought worthy to support the *first Philosophy!* What has St. PAUL done at last to deserve this honour? Why,

* Vol. V. p. 359. † Vol. V. p. 362.

‡ This is the title with which he dignifies SAINT PAUL, in his IVth vol. p. 423. What Pity was it, his Lordship did not know that *Theodoret* had called him a downright COBBLER.

in

in answer to the objections against God's dispensations in the religious World, the Apostle refers us, " for " intire satisfaction to the incomprehensible wisdom of " God, who frequently in the course of his providence " ordereth things in methods transcending our abilities " to discover or to trace *." This solution, which is here extolled for its great *modesty*, is referred to, in another place, for it's greater IMPUDENCE †.

But St. PAUL says, *we must have recourse to the incomprehensible wisdom of God.* In good time. But how does this prove that, in Paul's opinion, we have no adequate idea of the *moral attributes?* Unless the *quality* of an Agent, and his *action*, be one and the same thing.

Dr. BARROW, I presume, will stand his Lordship in no better stead than St. Paul. " As the dealings of " every wise man (says the Doctor) are sometimes " founded upon maxims, and admit justifications not " obvious or penetrable by vulgar conceit; so may " God act according to rules of wisdom and justice " which it may be quite impossible by our faculties to " apprehend, or with our means to descry. As there " are natural modes of Being and operation, so there " may be prudential and moral modes of proceeding, " far above our reach, peculiar objects of divine wisdom " not to be understood by any creature, especially by " creatures who stand in the lowest form of intelli- " gence; one remove from beasts. In fine, those " rules of equity and experience which we in our " transactions with one another do use, if they be " applied to the dealings of God will be found very " incongruous or deficient, the case being vastly altered

* Vol. V. p. 360. † Vol. III. p. 307.

" from

" from that infinite distance in nature and state between " God and us, and from the immense difference which " his relations towards us have from our relations to " one another *." What now has all this (which relates only to the *incomprehensible nature of God's providence)* to do with our *inadequate ideas of his moral attributes?* At least, if his Lordship will contend, that the man who thinks God's providence *incomprehensible*, must needs think our ideas of his moral attributes *inadequate*, he must go a step further, and confess, that Barrow supposed our ideas of the *natural* attributes to be *inadequate* likewise; for he puts both on the same footing. *As there are* NATURAL *modes of Being and operation* (says the Doctor), *so there may be prudential and* MORAL *modes of proceeding far above our reach.* But as this would be going too far; farther than the FIRST PHILOSOPHY will allow of, I suppose his Lordship would be content to give up this quotation from Barrow, as nothing to the purpose.

AT LAST, and when you would least expect it, Common-sense and Common-sentiments return. And God's moral attributes, after much ado, are allowed to be in Nature. " Where Religions (says his Lordship) " which pretend to be revealed, prevail, a new charac- " ter of God's *goodness* arises—an *artificial goodness* " which stands often in the place of the NATURAL †." And this, after he had so often told us, that we have no adequate idea of any goodness at all. Well, but as aukwardly as God's *natural goodness* comes (and, in every sense) *à posteriori*, yet it comes, and deserves to be made welcome. " All the knowledge (says he)

* Vol. V. p. 361, 362. † Vol. V. p. 431.

" that

" that God has given us the means to acquire, and " therefore all he designed we should have of his phy- " sical and MORAL nature and attributes, is derived " from *his works*, and from the TENOUR OF THAT " PROVIDENCE by which he governs them *." You will observe the words—*the tenour of that Providence* ——I have detected the sophistry of them before, where I have stated the meaning of the terms, *God's works*. I bid you observe them now, to judge of the following climax (if I may so call it), or his walk down stairs. The *wisdom* " is not so often discernible " by us [in God's works] as the power of God, nor " the *goodness* as the wisdom †." As scanty and slender as the knowledge is of God's moral attributes, which his Lordship here allows us to collect from his works, yet it flatly contradicts what his System had obliged him over and over to maintain; particularly in the following words—*Of divine goodness and divine justice* (says his Lordship in the person of Anaxagoras) *I am unable to frame any adequate notions* ‡, *from God's works*.

This Mock-concession is again repeated, and as carefully guarded. " By natural Theology (says his " Lordship) we are taught to acknowledge and adore " the infinite *wisdom* and *power* of God, which he has " manifested to us in some degree or other in every " part, even the most minute, of his Creation. *By* " *that too, we are taught to ascribe* GOODNESS *and* " JUSTICE *to him, wherever he intended we should so* " *ascribe them*, that is, wherever either his works, or the " dispensations of his providence, do as NECESSARILY

* Vol. V. p. 523, 524. † Vol. V. p. 335.
‡ Vol. IV. p. 116, 117.

" communicate

" communicate these notions to our minds, as those of " wisdom and power are communicated to us, in the " whole extent of both*."

What his Lordship would have you infer from this is, that we are NO WHERE taught to ascribe *goodness* and *justice* to God; since the *dispensations of his providence* do NO WHERE, in his Lordship's opinion, NECESSARILY *communicate these notions.* But allow him his premises, that neither God's Works nor Dispensations do NECESSARILY communicate to us the notions of God's goodness and justice; Would his conclusion follow, that therefore we are no where taught in these works and dispensations to ascribe those attributes unto him? Suppose these works and dispensations did only PROBABLY communicate these notions to our minds; will not this probability teach us to ascribe goodness and justice to him? God hath so framed the constitution of things, that man, throughout his whole conduct in life, should be necessarily induced to form his judgment on appearances and probable arguments. Why then not in this, as well as the rest? or rather, why not in this, above the rest? if so be God indeed had not (as I have shewn he hath) necessarily communicated these notions——But still, what is this to our *adequate* idea of the moral attributes, the point in question? God's not *necessarily communicating*, affects only the *reality*, not the *precision* of the idea. All therefore we learn by the observation, which would thus put the change upon us, is, that his Lordship has a very strong inclination, that God should have neither *goodness* nor *justice*; so far as they carry with them any DISPOSITION to *reward* or *punish*. For as to the

* Vol. V. p. 527.

Attributes

Attributes *themselves*, divested of their consequences; and undisturbed by our IMPIOUS IMITATION *, he has little or no quarrel with them. His Lordship certainly never intended to *teach* the common Reader more of the secrets of his Philosophy than what NECESSARILY arises from his *professions*. But to make God treat Mankind in this manner, to communicate to their minds the appearance of Attributes which he has not, is drawing an image of the Deity from his Lordship's own likeness; the very fault he so much censures in Divines. But if it must needs be, that God is to be represented either after Them, or after his Lordship, I should chuse to have the Clergy's God, though made out of no better stuff than ARTIFICIAL THEOLOGY (because this gives him both *goodness* and *justice)*, rather than his Lordship's God, which has neither; although composed of the more refined materials of the FIRST PHILOSOPHY. In the mean time, I will not deny but He may be right in what he says, That men conceive of the Deity, *more humano*; and that his Lordship's God and the Clergy's God are equally faithful copies of themselves.

In a word, if God *teaches*, whether clearly or obscurely, he certainly intended, we should *learn*. And what we get even by appearances, is real knowledge, upon his Lordship's own principles. For if TRUTH be, as he assures us it is, of so precarious a nature as to take it's Being from our own System, it must be *real* as far as it *appears*. "Our knowledge (says this great "Philosopher) is so dependent on our own system,

* OUR OBLIGATION TO IMITATE GOD IS A FALSE AND PROFANE DOCTRINE. Vol. V. p. 65.

"that

" that a great part of it would not be *knowledge* " perhaps, but *error* in any other *."

It is thus he involves himself in perpetual contradictions: And it will be always thus, when men dispute (for believe they cannot †) against common notices, and the most obvious truths; such as *liberty of will*; the *certainty of knowledge*; and this, which (I reckon) obtrudes itself upon us as forcibly as either, the MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF THE DEITY.

But the game is now on foot, let us follow it close. We have unravelled him through all his windings; and we may soon expect to see him take shelter in the thick cover of God's incomprehensible Nature; and rather than allow (more than in jest) the *moral attributes* of the Deity, ready to resolve all his Attributes, both *natural* and *moral*, into one INDEFINITE PERFECTION.

But soft. Not yet. We must come to it by degrees and regular advances. First, the *moral attributes* are to be *resolved* into the *natural*.

—— " If they [the *natural* and *moral* attributes] " may be considered separately, as we are apt to con- " sider them; and if the LATTER, and every thing we " ascribe to these, are not to be RESOLVED *rather into* " *the former*; into his infinite intelligence, wisdom, " and power ‡."——It is yet, we see, but a question; and that only, whether the *moral* attributes are not to be resolved into the *natural*. In the next passage the matter is determined. " I think (and what he thinks,

* Vol. iii. p. 356.

† Hear what he himself says of FREE-WILL. *The free-will of man no one can deny he has, without* LYING, *or renouncing his intuitive knowledge.* Vol. V. p. 406.

‡ Vol. V. p. 523, 524.

" he

" he holds it but reasonable we should all think) that " the *moral* attributes of the Supreme Being are *ab-* " *sorbed in his wisdom*; that we should consider them " only as different modifications of this *physical* " attribute *."

We are not yet near the top. However, before we go any higher, let us set together his INCONSISTENCIES, as they appear in this situation. Sometimes *the ideas of divine wisdom are better determined than those of divine goodness* †: Sometimes *we have no ideas at all of divine goodness* ‡: And sometimes again (as in the place before us), the *divine goodness is the same as wisdom*, and therefore, doubtless, (notwithstanding his Lordship) the idea of it as well defined. Now, of all these assertions, to which will he stick? To which, do you ask? To none of them, longer than they will stick to him: And straggling, undisciplined Principles, picked up at adventures, are not apt to stick long to any side: As soon as they begin to incline towards the enemy, he has done with them.——Come, if you will needs have it, you shall. The secret is this. The attributes are mere NAMES; and there is an end of them. All that remains, worth speaking of, is one undefined ETERNAL REASON: and so the Farce concludes.

" The moral ATTRIBUTES (says he) are *barely* " NAMES that we give to various manifestations of " the infinite wisdom of one *simple uncompounded* " *being* §."

" Of divine goodness and divine justice I am unable " to frame any adequate notions; and instead of con-

* Vol. V. p. 335.
† Vol. V. p. 341. 526.
‡ Vol. IV. p. 116, 117.
§ Vol. V. p. 453.

" ceiving

" ceiving such distinct moral attributes in the supreme " Being, *we ought, perhaps, to conceive nothing more* " *than this*, that THERE ARE VARIOUS APPLICATIONS " OF ONE ETERNAL REASON, WHICH IT BECOMES " US LITTLE TO ANALYZE INTO ATTRIBUTES *."

To this miserable refuge is his Lordship reduced, to avoid DIVINE JUSTICE. But why, the Reader will say, did he not speak out at first, and end his quarrel with the *moral attributes* at once? Your humble servant for that. Barefaced NATURALISM has no such charms as may make her received when and wherever she appears. There is need of much preparation, and not a little disguise, before you can get her admitted even to what is called *good company*.——But then, you will say, after he had resolved to speak out, Why did he stop again in his career; and, when his premisses are general against *all* attributes, his conclusion became particular, against the *moral* only? Not without reason, I assure you. He had need of the *natural* attributes, to set up against the *moral*; and therefore had himself *analyzed* this *eternal reason* into the specific attributes of *wisdom* and *power*. But when he saw his Adversaries might, by the same way, *analyze* it into *goodness and justice*, he then thought fit to pick a quarrel with his own method: But it was to be done obliquely. And hence arises all this embarrass and tergiversation. He would willingly, if his Readers would be so satisfied, analyze the *eternal reason* into *wisdom* and *power:* but there he would stop; and leave the other side of the *eternal reason*, unanalyzed: and if *goodness* and *justice* should chance to start out, he has a trick to *resolve* and *absorb* them into wisdom

* Vol. IV. p. 117.

and power, as only *different modifications of the physical attributes*. But if this should revolt his Readers, and they expect equal measure; then, rather than give them back the *goodness* and *justice* which he has been at all this pains to proscribe, he will throw *wisdom* and *power* after them, and *resolve* all into the ONE ETERNAL REASON.

Bashful NATURALISM has now thrown aside her Veil; and is, we see, ready to face down and defy her Rival; whom till now she was content to counterfeit. Give me leave, therefore, to repress this last effort of her insolence and of his Lordship's superior Wisdom. He now tells us, "that these pretended attributes, as they are commonly specified, and distinguished into *natural* and *moral*, are a mere human fiction; invented, by aid of analogy from the actions, passions, and qualities observable in man: and that the simple nature of Deity is one uniform perfection; of which, Infinity being the base, we can have no distinct idea or conception."

To this I reply, that it is indeed true, that these specific attributes, from which we deduce all our knowledge of the nature and will of God, are formed on analogy, and bear relation to ourselves. But then we say such attributes are not on that account the less real or essential. The light of the SUN is not in the orb itself, what we see it in the RAINBOW. There it is one candid, uniform, perfect blaze of glory: here we separate it's Perfection into the various attributes of red, yellow, blue, purple, and what else the subtle optician so nicely distinguishes. But still the *solar* light is not less real in the Rainbow, where it's rays become thus untwisted, and each differing thread distinctly seen in its effect, than while they remained

united and incorporated with one another in the Sun. Just so it is with the divine Nature: it is one simple individual Perfection in the Godhead himself: but when refracted and divaricated, in passing through the medium of the human mind, it becomes power, justice, mercy; which are all separately and ADEQUATELY represented to the understanding. But that his Lordship so frequently discards his own principles, I should hope he would submit to this illustration, since he owns *that we see the Deity in a reflected, not in a direct light**.

It is a true light then, and not a false: and the knowledge which it conveys is real, not fantastic: For mirrors are not wont to reflect the species of the mind's visions, but things exterior and substantial. To turn us, therefore, from God's *attributes*, (though the indirect, yet the well-defined, Image of him) because they discover something to us we may not like, a HELL and a FUTURE JUDGMENT, to turn us, I say, from these, to the *undefined eternal reason*, is doing like certain French Philosophers, who, when they quarrelled with Newton's Theory of light and colours, contrived to break the Prism by which it was demonstrated.

And now, Reader, let me ask, Who is there that deserves the name of MAN, and will not own, that they are the MORAL ATTRIBUTES of the Deity which make him AMIABLE; just as the *natural attributes* make him *revered?*—What is his Lordship's quarrel with the God of MOSES and PAUL, but that he is made *unamiable*, and represented without *goodness* or *justice? Their God*, therefore, he expressly tells us, *shall*

* Vol. V. p. 524.

*not be his God**. Well then: He has his God to make. And who would not expect to find him, when made by such a Workman, a God of infinite goodness and justice? No such matter: These qualities come not out of his Lordship's hands; so, cannot enter into the composition of his God: They are *barely* NAMES *that men give to various manifestations of the infinite wisdom of one simple uncompounded Being.* The pretended want of them in the God of the Jews afforded his Lordship a commodious cavil; for he had RELIGION to remove out of his way: But when he came to erect NATURALISM in it's stead, it had been very inconvenient to give them to his own Idol.

Honest Plutarch, though a Priest, was as warm an enemy to PRIESTCRAFT as his Lordship. He derives all the evils of Superstition from men's not acquiring the idea of a God *infinitely good and just.* And proposes this knowledge as the only cure for Superstition. This is consistent. But what would the ancient World have thought of their Philosopher, had his remedy, after hunting for it through a hundred volumes, been a God without any goodness and justice at all?

NATURE tells us, that the thing most desirable is the knowledge of a God whose goodness and justice gives to every man according to his works. His LORDSHIP tells us, that REASON or NATURAL RELIGION discovers to us no such God. Now, if both speak truth, How much are we indebted to REVELATION! Which, when *natural Religion* failed us, brings us to the knowledge of a God infinitely good and just; and gives us an adequate idea of those attributes! I

* "Can any man presume to say, that the God of Moses or the God of Paul is the true God?" &c. Vol. V. p. 567.

say

say no more than his Lordship has confessed.—*Christianity*, says he, DISCOVERS *the love of God to man; his infinite* JUSTICE *and* GOODNESS*.

Is this a blessing to be rejected? His Lordship has no room to say so, since the discovery is made in that very way, in which, upon his own Principles, it only could be made. He pretends, "We have no other natural way of coming to the knowledge of God, but from his *works*. By these, *he says*, we gain the idea of his *physical attributes*; and if there be any thing in his *works* which seems to contradict those attributes, 'tis only seeming: For as men advance in the knowledge of nature, the difficulties vanish. It is not so, he says, with regard to the *moral attributes*. There are so many *phænomena* which contradict these, and occasion difficulties never to be cleared up, that they hinder us from acquiring an *adequate* idea of the *moral attributes*." Now admitting all this to be true (for generally, his Lordship's assertions are so extravagant, that they will not even admit a supposition of their truth, though it be only for argument's sake), What does it effect but this, the giving *additional credit to Revelation?* The *physical difficulties* clear up as we advance in our knowledge of *Nature*, and we advance in proportion to our diligence and application. But the *moral difficulties* never clear up, because they rise out of the *Whole System* of God's moral dispensation; which is involved in clouds and darkness, impenetrable to mortal sight: and all the force of human wit alone will never be able to draw the veil. The assistance must come from another quarter. It must come, if it comes at all, from the Author of the Dispensation.

* Vol. V. p. 532.

Well; *Revelation* hath drawn this veil, and so, removed the darkness which obstructed our attaining an *adequate* idea of the *moral* attributes. Shall we yet stand out? And, when we are brought hither upon his Lordship's own principles, still withhold our assent? Undoubtedly you must. Beware (says he) of a pretended Revelation. Why so? "Because the Religion of nature is "perfect and absolute: and therefore Revelation can "teach nothing but what Religion hath already taught*." Strange; Why, *Revelation* teaches those *moral* attributes! which you, my Lord, own, *natural Religion* does not teach——Here we stick.

"Dic aliquem sodes, dic, Quintiliane, colorem:
Hæremus——"

And here, we are like to stick. His Lordship leaves us in a Riddle. Will you have the solution? It is foolish enough; as the solution of such kind of things generally are. But if the Reader hath kept his good humour, which, I confess, is difficult amidst all these provocations of impiety, it is enough to make him laugh. I said before, that his Lordship borrowed all his reasoning against Revelation, from such as Tindal, Toland, Collins, Chubb, and Morgan. This solemn argument particularly, of the PERFECTION OF NATURAL RELIGION, and the superseded use of Revelation, he delivers to us just as he found it in Tindal. Now Tindal, who pretended to hold that natural Religion taught both the *moral attributes* and a *future state*, had some pretence for saying that *it was perfect and absolute*. But what pretence has his Lordship to say it after him, who holds that natural Religion taught neither one nor the other? The truth is, he refused no arms against REVELATION; and the too eager pursuit

* Vol. V. p. 544.

of

of this his old enemy through thick and thin has led him into many of these scrapes.

To see his Lordship use TINDAL'S ARGUMENTS *against Revelation, and for the perfection of Natural Religion,* along with his OWN PRINCIPLES of *no moral attributes* and *no future state,* must needs give the Reader a very uncommon idea of his abilities: for the first of these principles makes one entire absurdity of all he borrows from Tindal against Revelation; and the second takes away the very pretence for *perfection* in natural Religion.

His Lordship's friend, *Swift,* has somewhere or other observed, that no subject in all Literature but Religion could have advanced TOLAND and ASGILL into the class of reputable Authors. Another of his friends seems to think that no subject but Religion could have sunk his Lordship so far below it: IF EVER LORD BOLINGBROKE TRIFLES (says *Pope),* IT WILL BE WHEN HE WRITES ON DIVINITY*. But such is the fate of Authors, when they chuse to write upon subjects for which they were not qualified either by *nature* or *grace.* For it is with authors as with Men: Who can guess *which Vessel was made for honour, and which for dishonour?* when sometimes, one and the same is made for both. Even this choice Piece of the FIRST PHILOSOPHY, his Lordship's sacred pages, is ready to be put to very different uses, according to the different tempers in which they have found his few Admirers on the one side, and the Public on the other; like the china Utensil in the DUNCIAD, which one Hero used for a p—pot, and another carried home for his Head-piece.

* Pope's Works, V. IX. Lett. xiv.

CONTINUATION OF BOOK II.

SECT. V.

HITHERTO we have shewn the Magistrate's care in PROPAGATING the belief of a God—of his Providence over human affairs—and of the way in which that Providence is chiefly dispensed; namely, by rewards and punishments in a *future state*. These things make the essence of Religion, and compose the body of it.

His next care was for the SUPPORT of Religion, so propagated. And this was done by UNITING it to the State, taking it under the civil protection, and giving it the rights and privileges of an ESTABLISHMENT. Accordingly we find that all states and people, in the ancient world, had an ESTABLISHED RELIGION; which was under the more *immediate* protection of the civil Magistrate, in contradistinction to those which were only TOLERATED.

How close these two Interests were united in the Egyptian Policy, is well known to all acquainted with Antiquity. Nor were the politest Republics less solicitous for the common interests of the two Societies, than that sage and powerful Monarchy (the nurse of arts and virtue) as we shall see hereafter, in the conduct both of Rome and Athens, for the support and preservation of the *established* worship.

But

But an *established Religion* is the voice of Nature; and not confined to certain ages, people, or religions. That great voyager and sensible observer of men and manners, J. Baptiste Tavernier, speaking of the kingdom of Tunquin, thus delivers himself concerning this universal policy, as he saw it practised, in his time, both in the East and West: "I come now to "the political description of this kingdom, under "which I comprehend the religion, which is, *almost* "*every where, in concert with the civil government,* "*for the mutual support of one another**."

That the Magistrate *established* Religion, united it to the State, and took it into his immediate protection for the sake of civil Society, cannot be questioned; the advantages to Government being so apparent.

But the necessity of this union for procuring those advantages, as likewise the number and extent of them, are not so easily understood. Nor indeed can they be understood without a perfect knowledge of the nature of an ESTABLISHED RELIGION, and of those principles of equity, on which it ariseth. But as this master-piece of human policy hath been of late, though but of late, called in question, after having from the first institution of Society, even to the present age, been universally practised by the Magistrate, and as universally approved by philosophers and divines; and as our question is the conduct of Lawgivers, and legitimate Magistrates, whose institutions are to be defended on the rules of reason and equity;

* Je viens à la description politique de ce royaume, dans laquelle je comprens la religion, qui est *presque en tous lieux de concert avec le gouvernement civil pour l'appuy reçiproque de l'un et de l'autre.* Relation nouvelle du Royaume de Tunquin, c. x. à la fin.

not

not of Tyrants, who set themselves above both; it will not be improper to examine this matter to the bottom; especially as the enquiry is so necessary to a perfect knowledge of the civil advantages, resulting from an *established religion.*

We must at present then lay aside our ideas of the ancient modes of civil and religious societies; and search what they are in themselves, by nature; and thence deduce the institution in question.

I shall do this in as few words as possible; and refer those, who desire a fuller account of this matter, to a separate discourse, intitled, THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE *.

In the beginning of the first book, where we speak of the origin of civil Society, the reader may remember we have shewn the natural deficiency of its plan; and how the influence and sanction of *Religion* only can supply that defect.

Religion then being proved necessary to Society; that it should be so used and applied, and in the best way, and to most advantage, needs no proof. For it is as instinctive in our nature to improve, as to investigate and pursue Good: and with regard to the improvement of this in question, there is special reason why it should be studied. For the experience of every place and age informs us, that the coactivity of *civil Laws and Religion,* is little enough to keep men from running into disorder and mutual violence.

But this improvement is the effect of art and contrivance. For all natural Good, every thing constitutionally beneficial to man, needs man's industry to make it better. We receive it at the provident hand

* See Vol. VII.

of

of Heaven, rather with a capacity of being applied to our use, than immediately fitted for our service. We receive it indeed, in full measure, but rude and unprepared.

Now, concerning this technical improvement of moral good, it is in *artificial* bodies as in *natural*; *two* may be so essentially constituted, as to be greatly able to adorn and strengthen one another: But then, as in this case, a mere juxta-position of the parts is not sufficient; so neither is it in that: some union, some coalition, some artful insertion into each other will be necessary.

But then again, as in natural bodies the artist is unable to set about the proper operation, till he hath acquired a competent knowledge of the nature of those bodies, which are the subject of his skill; so neither can we know in what manner Religion may be best applied to the service of the State, till we have learned the real and essential natures both of a *State* and a *Religion*. The *obvious* qualities of both sufficiently shew, that they must needs have a good effect on each other, when properly applied; (as our artist, by his knowledge of the obvious qualities of two natural bodies, we suppose, may make the like conclusion) though we have not yet got sufficient acquaintance with them to make the proper application.

It behoves us therefore to gain a right knowledge of the nature both of a *civil* and of a *religious* Society.

I. To begin with *civil Society:* It was instituted either with the purpose of attaining all the good of every kind, it was even accidentally capable of producing; or only of some certain good, which the Institutors had in view, unconcerned with, and unattentive

tentive to any other. To suppose its end to be the vague purpose of acquiring all possible accidental good, is, in politics, a mere solecism; as hath been sufficiently shewn by the writers on this question*. And how untrue it is in fact, may be gathered from what hath been said in the beginning, of the origin of Society. Civil society then, I suppose, will be allowed to have been instituted for the attainment of some certain end or ends, exclusive of others: and this implies the necessity of distinguishing this end from others. Which distinction arises from the different properties of the things pretending. But again, amongst all those things, which are apt to obtrude, or have, in fact, obtruded upon men, as the ends of civil government, there is only this difference in their properties, as ends; *That, one of them is attainable by civil Society only, and all the rest are easily obtained without it.* The thing then with that property or quality must needs be the genuine end of *civil Society*. And this end is no other than SECURITY TO THE TEMPORAL LIBERTY AND PROPERTY OF MAN. For this end (as we have shewn) civil Society was invented; and *this*, civil Society alone is able to procure. The great, but spurious rival of this end, the SALVATION OF SOULS, or the security of man's *future* happiness, belongs therefore to the other division. For *this* not depending on outward accidents, or on the will or power of another, as the body and goods do, may be as well attained in a state of nature, as in civil society; and therefore, on the principles here

* See Locke's Defences of his Letters on Toleration. This appears to have been Aristotle's opinion—— φύσει μὲν ἓν διώρισαι τὸ θῆλυ, καὶ τὸ ἄῤῥεν· ἐδὲν γὰρ ἡ φύσις ποιεῖ τοιοῦτον, οἷον χαλκοτύποι τὴν Δελφικὴν μάχαιραν πενιχρῶς, ἀλλ' ἓν πρὸς ἕν, &c. Pol. l. i. c. 2.

delivered,

delivered, cannot be one of the causes of the institution of civil government; nor, consequently, one of the ends thereof. But if so, the promotion of it comes not within the proper province of the Magistrate.

II. *Secondly*, as to religious Society, or a Church. This being instituted to preserve purity of faith and worship, its ultimate end is the SALVATION OF SOULS: From whence it follows,

1. That *the religious Society must needs be* SOVEREIGN, and INDEPENDENT ON THE CIVIL. Natural dependency of one Society on another, arises either from the *law of nature*, or *of nations*. Dependency by the *law of nature*, is from *essence* or *generation*. Dependency from *essence* there can be none. For this kind of dependency being a mode of natural union and coalition; and coalition being only where there is an agreement *in eodem tertio*; and there being no such agreement between two Societies essentially different, as these are, there can possibly be no dependency. Dependency from *generation* is where one Society springs up from another; as corporations, colleges, companies, and chambers, in a city. These, as well by the conformity of their ends and means, as by their charters of incorporation, betray their original and dependency. But *religious Society*, by ends and means quite different, gives internal proof of its not arising from the State; and we have shewn by external evidence*, that it existed before the state had any being. Again, no dependency can arise from the *law of nations*, or the *civil law*. Dependency by this law is, where one and the same people composing two different Societies, the *imperium* of the one clashes with

* See Book III. sect. 6.

the

the *imperium* of the other. And, in such case, the lesser Society becomes, by that law, dependent on the greater; because the not being so, would make that absurdity in politics, called *imperium in imperio.* But now *civil* and *religious* Society, having ends and means entirely different; and the means of *civil* Society being *coercive* power, which power therefore the *religious* hath not; it follows, that the administration of each Society is exercised in so remote spheres, that they can never meet to clash: And those Societies which never clash, necessity of state cannot bring into dependency on one another.

2. It follows, *That this independent religious Society hath not, in and of itself, any coactive power of the civil kind:* Its inherent jurisdiction being, in its nature and use, entirely different from that of the State. For if, as hath been proved, *civil Society* was instituted for the attainment of one species of good (all other good, requisite to human happiness, being to be attained without it) and that *civil Society* attains the good, for which it was ordained, by the *sole* mean of coercive power; then it follows, that the good, which any other kind of Society seeks, may be attained without that power; consequently, *coercive* power is unnecessary to a *religious Society.* But that mean, which is *unnecessary* for the attainment of any end, is likewise *unfit*; in all cases, but in that, where such mean is rendered unnecessary by the use of other means of the same kind or species. But *religious society* attains its end by means of a different kind; therefore *coercive* power is not only unnecessary, but unfit. Again, Ends, in their nature different, can never be attained by one and the same mean. Thus in the case before us: *coercive* power

power can only influence us to outward practice; by outward practice only, is the good which *civil Society* aims at, immediately effected; therefore is *coercive* power peculiarly fit for *civil Society*. But the good, which *religious Society* aims at, cannot be effected by outward practice; therefore *coercive* power is altogether unfit for *this* Society.

Having thus by a diligent enquiry found,

I. First, *That the care of the civil Society extends only to the body, and its concerns; and the care of the religious Society only to the soul:* it necessarily follows, that the civil Magistrate, if he will improve this natural influence of Religion by human art and contrivance, must seek some UNION or ALLIANCE with the *Church*. For his office not extending to the *care of souls*, he hath not, in himself, power to enforce the influence of religion: and the *Church*'s province not extending to the *body*, and consequently being without coactive power, she has not, in herself alone, a power of applying that influence to *civil* purposes. The conclusion is, that their joint powers must co-operate thus to apply and inforce the influence of *religion*. But they can never act conjointly but in *union* and *alliance*.

II. *Secondly*, having found *that each society is sovereign, and independent on the other*, it as necessarily follows, that such *union* can be produced only by FREE CONVENTION AND MUTUAL COMPACT: because, whatever is sovereign and independent, can be brought to no act without its own consent: but nothing can give birth to a *free convention*, but a sense of mutual wants, which may be supplied; or a view of mutual benefits, which may be gained by it.

Such

Such then is the nature of that *Union* which produceth a RELIGION BY LAW ESTABLISHED: and which is, indeed, no other than *a public league and alliance for mutual support and defence.* For the *State* not having the *care of souls*, cannot inforce the influence of *religion*; and therefore seeks the concurring aid of the *Church:* and the *Church* having no *coercive power* (the consequence of its care's not extending to *bodies)* as naturally flies for protection to the *State:* this being of that kind of *Alliance* which Grotius calls FŒDUS INÆQUALE —— "Inæquale fœdus (say she) "hic intelligo quod ex ipsa vi pactionis *manentem* "*prælationem* quandam alteri donat: hoc est, ubi "quis tenetur alterius imperium ac majestatem con-"servare UT POTENTIORI PLUS HONORIS, INFIRMI-"ORI PLUS AUXILII DEFERATUR*."

An *Alliance*, then, *by free convention*, being in its nature such that each party must have its motives for contracting; our next enquiry will be,

I. What those motives were, which the State had for *seeking*, and the Church for *accepting*, the offers of an union: And,

II. The *mutual benefits* and advantages thereby arising.

The motives the Magistrate had to seek this *alliance*, were these:

I. To preserve the essence and purity of religion;

II. To improve its usefulness, and apply its influence in the best manner;

III. To prevent the mischief which, in its natural independent state, it might occasion to civil society.

* De Jure Belli et Pac. l. I. c. 3. § 21.

I. The

I. The Magistrate was induced to seek it, 1. *As the necessary means of preserving the being of religion.* For though (as hath been shown in the treatise of *the Alliance**) religion constitutes a Society; and though this Society will indeed, for some time, support the existence of religion, which, without it, would soon vanish from amongst men; yet, if we consider that religious Society is made up of the same individuals which compose the civil; and destitute likewise of all coercive power; we must needs see, that a Society, abandoned to its own fortune, without support or protection, would, in no long time, be swallowed up and lost. Of this opinion was a very able writer, whose knowledge of human nature will not be disputed:

" Were it not, says he, for that sense of virtue, " which is principally preserved, so far as it is pre- " served, BY NATIONAL FORMS AND HABITS OF " RELIGION, men would soon lose it all, run wild, " prey upon one another, and do what else the worst " of savages do †."

2. But of whatever use an *Alliance* may be thought, for preserving the *being* of religion, the necessity of it, for preserving its *purity*, is most evident: for if *truth*, and *public utility* coincide, the nearer any religion approacheth to the truth of things, the fitter that religion is for the service of the State. That they do coincide, that is, that truth is productive of utility, and utility indicative of truth, may be proved on any principles, but the atheistic; and therefore we think it needless,

* Book I. Chap. V.

† Wollaston's Religion of Nature delineated, p. 124. Quarto Edit. 1725.

in this place, to draw out the argument in form*: Let us then consider the danger religion runs of deviating from truth, when left, in its natural state, to itself. In those circumstances, the men of highest credit, are such as are famed for greatest sanctity. This *sanctity* hath been generally understood to be then most perfect, when most estranged from the world, and all its habits and relations. But this being only to be acquired by secession and retirement from affairs; and that secession rendering man ignorant of civil Society, and of its rights and interests; in place of which will succeed, according to his natural temper, the destructive follies either of superstition or fanaticism, we must needs conclude, that religion, under such directors and reformers, (and God knows these are generally its lot) will deviate from truth; and consequently from a capacity, in proportion, of serving civil Society. I wish I could not say, we have too many examples to support this observation. The truth is, we have seen, and yet do see religious Societies, some grown up, and continuing unsupported by, and *ununited* with the State; others, that, when supported and *united*, have by strange arts brought the State into subjection, and become its tyrants and usurpers; and thereby defeated all the good which can arise from this *Alliance*; such Societies, I say, we have seen, whose religious doctrines are so little serviceable to civil Government, that they can prosper only on the ruin and destruction of it. Such are those which teach *the holiness of celibacy and asceticism, the sinfulness of defensive war, of capital punishments, and even of civil magistracy itself.*

* See Book III. § 6.

On the other hand, when religion is in *Alliance* with the State, as it then comes under the Magistrate's direction, those holy leaders having now neither credit nor power to do mischief, its purity must needs be reasonably well supported and preserved; for truth and public utility coinciding, the civil Magistrate, as such, will see it for his interest to seek after, and promote truth in religion: and, by means of public utility, which his office enables him so well to understand, he will never be at a loss, where such truth is to be found: so that it is impossible, under this civil influence, for religion ever to deviate far from truth; always supposing (for on such supposition this whole theory proceeds) a LEGITIMATE Government, or civil policy, established on the principles of the natural rights and liberties of man: for an unequal and unjust Government, which seeks its own, not public utility, will always have occasion for error: and so, must corrupt religion both in principle and practice, to promote its own wrong interests.

II. Secondly, the Magistrate was induced to seek this Alliance, *as the necessary means to improve the usefulness, and to apply in the best manner the influence of religion for his service.* And this an *Alliance* does by several ways.

1. *By bestowing additional reverence and veneration on the person of the civil* MAGISTRATE, *and on the* LAWS *of the State.* For, in this alliance, where the religious Society is taken into the protection of the State, the supreme Magistrate, as will be shewn hereafter, is acknowledged HEAD *of the religion.* Now nothing can be imagined of more efficacy for securing the obedience of the people. Those two great mas-

ters in politics, Aristotle and Machieval, as we have seen, thought it of force enough to gain reverence and security to a tyrant. What then must we suppose its efficacy in a legitimate Magistrature? The same veneration will extend itself over the *Laws* likewise: for while some of them are employed by the State for the *support of the Church*, and others *lent* to the Church, to be employed in the *service of the State*, and all of them enacted by a *legislature, in which churchmen have a* considerable *share* (all these things being amongst the conditions of *Alliance* *) laws under such direction, must needs be regarded with the greatest reverence.

2. *By lending to the* CHURCH *a coactive power.*—It may be remembered, that, in speaking of the innate defects of civil Society, we observed, that there were several sorts of duties which civil laws could not inforce; such as the duties of IMPERFECT OBLIGATION; which a religious Society, when endowed with *coercive power*, to invigorate the influence of religion, is capable of exacting: and SUCH likewise of the duties of PERFECT OBLIGATION; whose breach is owing to the intemperance of the sensual appetites; the severe prohibition of which threatens greater and more enormous evils: for while these unruly passions overflow, the stopping them in one place is causing them to break out with greater violence in another; as the rigorous punishment of fornication hath been generally seen to give birth to unnatural lusts. The effectual correction therefore of such evils must be begun by moderating and subduing the passions themselves.

* See Vol. VII. "Alliance between Church and State," Book II. Chap. III.

But

But *this*, civil laws are not understood to prescribe*; as punishing those passions only when they proceed to *act*; and not rewarding the attempts to *subdue* them: it must be a tribunal regarding irregular intentions as criminal, and good desires as meritorious, which can work this effect; and this can be no other than the tribunal of religion. When that is once done, a coactive power of the civil kind may be applied to good purpose; but not till then: and who so fit to apply it as that Society, which prepared the subject for its due application and reception? † Again, it hath been observed ‡, that the State punishes deviations from the rule of right as *crimes* only; and not as *such deviations*, or as *sins*; and, on the idea of crimes, proportions its punishments; by which means some very enormous deviations from the rule of right, which do not immediately affect society, and so are not considered as *crimes*, are overlooked by the civil tribunal: yet these, being, though *mediately*, very pernicious to the state, it is for its interests they should be brought before some capable tribunal. But, besides the civil, there is no other than the ecclesiastical, endowed with coactive power. *Hence may be deduced the true, and only, end and use of* SPIRITUAL COURTS. A church

* See note [FF] at the end of this Book.

† A jurisdiction somewhat resembling this we find in the famous court of AREOPAGUS at Athens: which city was once the model of *civil prudence* as well as of *religion*, to the improved part of mankind. Isocrates speaking of this branch of jurisdiction in the Areopagus, says, "It was not exerted to PUNISH crimes, but to PREVENT them——ὐ τȣ̃το πρῶτον ἐσκόπȣν, δι' ὧν κωλάσȣσι τȣ̀ς ἀκοσμȣ̃ντας, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν ἂν κατασκευάσȣσι μηδὲν αὐτȣ̀ς ἄξιον ζημίας βȣλήσεσθαι ἁμαρτάνειν· ἡγȣ̃ντο γὰρ τȣ̃το μὲν αὐτῶν ἔργο νεῖναι. ΑΡΕΙΟΠ. ΛΟΓ.

‡ See the Alliance, Book I. Chap. IV.

tribunal then, with coactive power, being necessary in all these cases; and a *religious* Society having, in itself, no such power, it must be borrowed from the State: but a State cannot lend it, without great danger to itself, *but* on the terms of an *Alliance*; a State therefore will be induced to seek this Alliance, in order to improve the natural efficacy of religion.

3. *By conferring on the State the* application *of the efficacy of religion, and by putting it under the Magistrate's direction.*——There are certain junctures, when the influence of religion is more than ordinarily serviceable to the State: and these, the civil Magistrate only knows. Now while a Church is in its natural state of independency, it is not in his power to improve those conjunctures to the advantage of the State, by a proper application of religion: but when the *Alliance* is made, and consequently the Church under his direction, he hath then authority to prescribe such public exercises of religion, and at such times, and in such manner, as he finds the exigencies of State require.

4. *By engaging the Church to apply its utmost endeavours in the service of the State.* For an *Alliance* laying an obligation on the State to protect and defend the Church, and to provide a settled maintenance for its ministers, such benefits must needs produce the highest love and esteem for the benefactor: which will be returned, out of motives both of gratitude and interest, in the most zealous labours for the service of civil Government.

III. Lastly, *the State was induced to seek this Alliance, as the only means of preventing the mischiefs,*

which the Church, in its natural independent condition, might occasion to civil Society. For, in this state the Church having, of itself, a power of assembling for religious worship, factious men may commodiously, under that cover, hatch and carry on designs against the peace of civil Government: and the influence which popular and leading men gain over the consciences of such assemblies, by the frequency of occasional harangues, may easily ripen these contrivances into act, when strengthened with the specious pretext of religion: all which evils are effectually remedied by this *Alliance*. For then, the civil Magistrate being become protector of the Church, and, consequently, supreme HEAD and director of it, the ministry is mostly in his power; that mutual dependency, between the clergy and people, being, by means of a settled revenue, quite broken and destroyed. He admits and excludes to the *exercise* of their function, as he sees fit; and grants it to none, but such as give a previous security for their allegiance to him: by which means, all that influence, which the ministers and leaders in a Church had over it before the Alliance, *as the protectors of religion*, is now drawn off from them, and placed solely in the civil Magistrate.

Another mischief there is in this *unallied* condition of the Church, still as certain and fatal, whenever more than one religion is found in a State. For in these latter ages, every sect thinking itself the only *true* church, or, at least, the *most perfect*, is naturally pushed on to advance its own scheme upon the ruins of the rest: and where argument fails, civil power is brought in, as soon as ever a party can be formed in the *public administration:* and we find, they have been but too successful in persuading the Magistrate that

his interests are concerned in their religious differences. Now the most effectual remedy to the dangerous and strong convulsions, into which States are so frequently thrown by these struggles, is an *Alliance*, which establishes *one church*, and gives *a full toleration to the rest*; only keeping sectaries out of *the public administration:* from a heedless admission into which, these disorders have arisen.

Having now shown the principal motives which engaged the State to *seek* an *Alliance* with the Church;

I come, in the next place, to consider the motives which the Church had to *accept* of it. For this being, as is observed, a FREE CONVENTION, unless the Church, as well as State, had its proper views, no *Alliance* could have been formed. To discover these motives, we must recollect what hath been said of the nature and end of a *religious Society:* for the benefits adapted to that nature and end, must be her legitimate motive: but if so, this benefit can be no other than SECURITY FROM ALL EXTERNAL VIOLENCE. The State indeed could not justly offer it, had no Alliance been made: but this is no reason why the Church should not think it for its interest to secure its natural right by *compact*; any more than that one State should not stipulate with another not to do it violence, though *that other* was under prior obligations, by the law of nature and nations, to forbear.

But by this *Alliance* between the two Societies, the State does more: it not only promises not to injure the *Church* confederated, but to serve it; that is, to protect it from the injuries of other religious Societies, which then exist, or may afterwards arise in the State. How one religious Society may be injuriously affected by

by another, hath been shown just before; how great those injuries may prove, will be shown hereafter. It must needs then be the first care of a Church, and a reasonable care, to preserve itself, by all lawful ways, from outward violence. A State then, as hath been said, in order to induce the Church's acceptance of this offer, must propose some benefit by it: and because this is the only *legitimate* benefit the Church can receive, it must propose *this:* which, therefore, being considerable, will be the Church's *motive for Alliance.*

There are only two other considerations that can be esteemed *motives:* the one, *to engage the State to propagate the established religion by force:* and the other, *to bestow honours, riches, and powers upon it.* Now, on recurring to the nature and end of the two Societies, the *first* motive will be found *unjust*; and the *second, impertinent.* It is *unjust* in the Church to require the engagement; because the performing it would be violating the natural right every man hath of worshipping God according to his own conscience. It is *unjust* in the State to engage in it; because, as we have shown, its jurisdiction extendeth not to opinions.

It is *impertinent* in a Church to aim at riches, honours, and powers, because these are things which, as a Church, she can neither use nor profit by; for they have no natural tendency to promote the *ultimate* end of this Society, *salvation of souls*; nor the *immediate* end, *purity of worship.* "Nihil ecclesia sibi nisi fidem "possidet *," says St. Ambrose. We conclude, therefore, that the only legitimate motive she could have, was *security and protection from outward violence.*

* Epist. contra Symmachum.

On

On these mutual motives was formed this FREE ALLIANCE: which gave birth to a CHURCH BY LAW ESTABLISHED.

Now as from the nature of the two Societies is discovered what kind of union only they could enter into; so from that consideration, together with the motives they had in uniting, may be deduced, by necessary inference, the reciprocal TERMS and conditions of that union.

From the mutual motives inducing thereunto, it appears, that the great *preliminary and fundamental article* of *Alliance* is this, THAT THE CHURCH SHALL APPLY ITS UTMOST INFLUENCE IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE; AND THAT THE STATE SHALL SUPPORT AND PROTECT THE CHURCH.

But in order to the performance of this agreement, there must be a *mutual communication of their respective powers:* for the province of each Society being naturally distinct and different, each can have to do in the other's, but by mutual concession.

But again, these Societies being likewise as naturally independent one on the other, a mutual concession cannot be safely made, without one of them, at the same time, giving up its INDEPENDENCY: from whence arises what Grotius, we see, called MANENS PRÆLATIO: which, in his *Fœdus inæquale*, the more powerful Society hath over the less.

Now from these two conclusions, which spring necessarily from *the great fundamental article of union*, we deduce all the terms, conditions, mutual grants, and concessions, which complete this *Alliance*.

For, from this obligation on the Church *to apply its influence in the service of the State*, arise a SETTLED MAINTENANCE FOR THE MINISTERS OF RELIGION; and

and an ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION with *coactive* power: which things introduce again, on the other side, the DEPENDENCY OF THE CLERGY ON THE STATE. And from the State's obligation *to support and protect the Church*, ariseth the ECCLESIASTICAL SUPREMACY OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE; which again introduceth, on the other hand, the right of CHURCHMEN TO PARTAKE OF THE LEGISLATURE.

Thus are all these Rights and Privileges closely interwoven and mutually conncected by a necessary dependence on each other.

But to be more particular in the grounds and reasons of each grant and privilege, we will now, in a different and more commodious order for this purpose, examine,

I. What the Church RECEIVES from the State.

II. What the Church GIVES to it.

Which will present us with *a new view of the two Societies, as they appear under an Establishment*; and leave nothing wanting to enable us to form a perfect judgment of their natures.

I. What the Church *receives* from the state by this *Alliance*, is,

1. First, *A public and settled endowment for its ministers.* The reasons of it are, 1. To render the religious Society, whose assistance the State so much wants, more firm and durable. 2. To invite and encourage the clergy's best service to the State, in rendering those committed to their care, virtuous. But, 3. and principally, in order to destroy that mutual dependency between the clergy and people, which arises from the former's being maintained by the voluntary

luntary contributions of the latter; the only maintenance the clergy could have, before the two Societies were allied; and which dependence, we have shewn to be productive of great mischiefs to the State. Add to all this, that as the clergy are now under the Magistrate's direction, and consequently become a public Order in the State, it is but fit and decent, that the State should provide them with a public maintenance.

2. The second privilege the Church receives from this Alliance is, *a place for her representatives in the Legislature.* For, as it necessarily follows, from that *fundamental article of Alliance* of the *State's supporting and protecting the Church*, that the Church must, in return, *give up its independency to the State*, whereby the State becomes empowered to determine in all church-matters, so far as the Church is considered under the idea of a Society; as this, I say, necessarily follows, the Church must needs have its representatives in the Legislature, to prevent that power, which the State receives in return for the protection it affords, from being perverted to the Church's hurt: for the giving up its independency, without reserving a right of representation in the legislature, would be making itself, instead of a *subject*, a *slave* to the State. Besides, without these representatives no laws could be reasonably made concerning the Church; because no free man, or body, can be bound by laws, to which they have not given their consent, either in person, or by representative. So that, as the Church when she entered into alliance, cannot *justly*, we may presume she did not *willingly*, give up her independency without the reservation of some such prerogative.

3. The

3. The third and last privilege is, *a jurisdiction, inforced by civil coactive power*, FOR REFORMATION OF MANNERS. It is one of the *preliminary* articles of this *Alliance*, that *the Church should apply its best influence in the service of the State.* But there is no way in which it can be so effectually inforced as by a jurisdiction of this kind. It hath been shewn above, that there are a numerous set of duties, both of *imperfect obligation*, which civil laws could not reach; and several of *perfect obligation*, which, by reason of the intemperance of the sensual passions, from whence the breach of those duties proceeds, civil laws could not effectually inforce; as their violence yielded only to the influence of Religion; both which, however, the good of the Community requires should be inforced; and which an ecclesiastical tribunal, intrusted with coactive power, is only able to inforce. And, indeed, the sense of those wants and defects, which these courts do supply, was the principal motive of the State's seeking this *Alliance.* On the other hand, the Church having now given up her supremacy, she would without the accession of this authority, be left naked and defenceless, and reduced to a condition unbecoming her dignity, and dangerous to her safety.

II. Let us now see, what the Church *gives* to the State. It is, in a word, this: *The resigning up her independency; and making the civil Magistrate her* SUPREME HEAD, *without whose approbation and allowance she can administer, transact, or decree nothing in quality of a policied Society.* For as the State, by this *Alliance*, hath undertaken the protection of the *Church*; and as no Society can safely afford protection to another over which it hath no power, it necessarily

sarily follows that the *civil Magistrate must be supreme*. Besides, when the State, by this convention, covenanted to afford protection to the Church, that contract was made to a particular Church of one denomination, and of such determined doctrine and discipline. But now, that protection, which might be advantageous to the State in union with such a Church, might be disadvantageous to it, in union with one of a different doctrine and discipline: therefore, when protection is given to a Church, it must be at the same time provided, that no alteration be made in it, without the State's approbation and allowance. Farther, the State having *endowed its clergy*, and bestowed upon them a *jurisdiction with coactive power*, these privileges might create an *imperium in imperio*, had not the civil Magistrate, in return, the *supremacy of the Church*. The necessity of the thing, therefore, invests him with this right and title.

Thus have we shewn the mutual privileges *given* and *received* by Church and State, in entering into this famous *convention:* the aim of the State being, agreeably to its nature, UTILITY; and the aim of the Church, agreeably to its nature, TRUTH. From whence we may observe, that as these privileges all took their rise, by necessary inference, from the fundamental article of the convention, which was, *that the Church should serve the State*; *and the State protect the Church*; so they receive all possible addition of strength from their mutual connection with, and dependency on, one another. This we have cause to desire may be received as a certain mark that our *plan of Alliance* is no precarious arbitrary hypothesis, but a *theory*, founded in reason, and the invariable nature of things. For having, from the real essense of the two Societies, collected the *necessity* of allying,

and

and the *freedom* of the compact; we have, from the *necessity*, fairly introduced it; and from its *freedom*, consequentially established every mutual term and condition of it. So that now if the reader should ask, *where this charter or treaty of convention for the union of the two Societies, on the terms here delivered, is to be met with*; we are enabled to answer him. We say, it may be found in the same archive with the famous ORIGINAL COMPACT between magistrate and people, so much insisted on in the vindication of the *common rights of subjects*. Now, when a sight of this *compact* is required of the defenders of civil liberty, they hold it sufficient to say, that it is enough for all the purposes of fact and right, that such *original compact* is the only legitimate foundation of civil Society: that if there were no such thing *formally* executed, there was *virtually*: that all differences between magistrate and people, ought to be regulated on the supposition of such a *compact*; and all Government reduced to the principles therein laid down: for, that the happiness, of which civil Society is productive, can only be attained, when formed on those principles. Now something like this we say of our ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

Hitherto we have considered this *Alliance* as it produceth an *establishment*, under its most simple form; *i.e.* where there is but *one* Religion in the State: but it may so happen, that, either at the time of convention, or afterwards, there may be *more than one*.

1. If there be *more than one at the time of convention*, the State allies itself with the *largest* of the religious Societies. It is *fit* the State should do so, because the larger the religious Society is (where there

is

is an equality in other points) the better enabled it will be to answer the ends of an *Alliance*; as having the greatest number under its influence. It is *scarce possible* it should do otherwise; because the two Societies being composed of the same individuals, the greatly prevailing religion must have a majority of its members in the assemblies of State; who will naturally prefer their own religion to any other. With *this* Religion is the *Alliance* made; and a full TOLERATION given to all the rest; yet under the restriction of a TEST-LAW, to keep them from hurting that which is *established*.

2. If these different religions spring up *after* the Alliance hath been formed; then, whenever they become considerable, a *test-law* is necessary, for the security of the *established church*. For amongst diversities of sects, where every one thinks itself the *only true*, or at least the *most pure*, every one aims at rising on the ruins of the rest; which it calls, *bringing into conformity* with itself. The means of doing this, when reason fails, which is rarely at hand, and more rarely heard when it is, will be by getting into the public administration, and applying the civil power to the work. But when one of these Religions is the *established*, and the rest under a *toleration*; then envy, at the advantages of an *establishment*, will join the *tolerated churches* in confederacy against it, and unite them in one common attack to disturb its quiet. In this imminent danger, the *allied church* calls upon the State, for the performance of its contract; which thereupon gives her a TEST-LAW for her security: whereby, the entrance into the Administration of public affairs (the only way, the threatened mischief

is effected) is shut to all but members of the *established church*.

Thus a TEST-LAW took its birth, whether *at* or *after* the time of *Alliance*. That the State is under the highest obligations to provide the Church with this security, we shall shew,

1. By the *Alliance*, the State promised to protect the Church, and to secure it from the injuries and insults of its enemies. An attempt in the members of any other church to get into the administration, in order to deprive the *established church* of the covenanted rights which it enjoys, either by sharing those advantages with it, or by drawing them from it to itself, is highly injurious. And we have shewn, that where there are diversities of religions, this attempt will be always making. The State then must defeat the attempt: but there is no other way of defeating it, than by hindering its enemies from entering into the Administration: and they can be hindered only by a *test-law*.

2. Again, this promise of protection is of such a nature as may, on no pretence, be dispensed with. For protection was not simply a condition of *Alliance*, but, on the Church's part, the only condition of it. We have shewn, that all other benefits and advantages are foreign to a Church, as such, and improper for it. Now, not performing the *only condition* of a contract, virtually breaks and dissolves it: especially if we consider that this only condition is both *necessary* and *just*. *Necessary*, as a free convention must have *mutual* conditions; and, but for this condition, one side would be without any: *Just*, as the convention itself is founded on the laws of nature and nations; and

this the only condition which suits the nature of a Church to claim. If it be pretended, that debarring good subjects from *places of honour and profit*, in the disposal of the Magistrate, is *unjust*; I reply, that the assertion, though every where taken for granted, is false; it being founded on the principle, that *reward is one of the sanctions of civil laws*, which I have shewn to be a mistake*; and that all, a member of Society can *claim*, for the discharge of his duty, is *protection*. So that, farther reward than this, no subject having a *right* to, all *places of honour and profit* are free donations, and in the absolute disposal of the Magistrate.

3. But again, the Church, in order to enable the State to perform this *sole condition* of protection, consented to the giving up its supremacy and independency, to the civil Sovereign: whence it follows, that, whenever the enemies of the *established* Church get into the magistrature, to which, as we have said, the supremacy of the Church is transferred by the *Alliance*, she becomes a prey, and lies entirely at their mercy; being now, by the loss of her supremacy, in no condition of defence, as she was in her natural state, unprotected and independent; so that the not securing her by a *test-law*, is betraying, and giving her up bound to her enemies.

4. But lastly, had no promise of protection been made, yet the State would have lain under an indispensable necessity of providing a *test-law*, for its own peace and security. It hath been observed, that wherever there are diversities of religion, each sect,

* See Book I. sect. 2.

believing

believing its own the true, strives to advance itself on the ruins of the rest. If this doth not succeed by dint of argument, these partisans are apt to have recourse to the coercive power of the State: which is done by introducing a party into the public administration. And they have always had art enough to make the State believe that its interests were much concerned in the success of their religious quarrels. What persecutions, rebellions, revolutions, loss of civil and religious liberty, these intestine struggles between sects have occasioned, is well known to such as are acquainted with the history of mankind. To prevent these mischiefs was, as hath been shewn, one great motive for the State's seeking *Alliance* with the Church: for the obvious remedy was the *establishing one church*, and giving a *free toleration to the rest*. But if, in administering this cure, the State should stop short, and not proceed to exclude the *tolerated* religions from entering into the public administration, such imperfect application of the remedy would infinitely heighten the distemper: for, before the *Alliance*, it was only a mistaken aim in propagating truth, which occasioned these disorders: but now, the zeal for opinions would be out of measure inflamed by envy and emulation; which the temporal advantages, enjoyed by the established church, exclusive of the rest, will always occasion: And what mischiefs this would produce, had every sect a free entry into the administration, the reader may easily conceive. If it be said, that, would men content themselves, as in reason they ought, with enjoying their own opinions, without obtruding them upon others, these evils, which require the remedy of a *test-law*, would never happen. This is very true: and so, would men but observe the rule of justice in

general, there would be no need to have recourse to civil Society, to rectify the violations of it.

In a word, an ESTABLISHED RELIGION WITH A TEST-LAW is the universal voice of Nature. The most savage nations have employed it to civilize their manners; and the politest knew no other way to prevent their return to barbarity and violence.

Thus the city of ATHENS, so humane and free, exacted an oath of all their youth for the security of the established religion: for, Athens being a democracy, every citizen had a constant share in the administration. A copy of this oath, the strongest of all *tests*, is preserved by Stobæus, who transcribed it from the writings of the Pythagoreans, the great school of ancient politics. It is conceived in these words: "I will not "dishonour the *sacred arms* *, nor desert my comrade "in battle: I will DEFEND AND PROTECT MY "COUNTRY AND MY RELIGION, whether alone or in "conjunction with others: I will not leave the public "in a worse condition than I found it, but in a better: "I will be always ready to obey the supreme magis- "trate, with prudence; and to submit to the established "laws, and to all such as shall be hereafter established "by full consent of the people: and I will never "connive at any other who shall presume to despise "or disobey them; but will revenge all such attempts "on the sanctity of the republic, either alone or in "conjunction with the people: and lastly, I WILL "CONFORM TO THE NATIONAL RELIGION. So

* Ὅπλα τὰ ἱερά, the *sacred arms*, by what follows, seems to mean those which the lovers presented to their favourite youths. Concerning this institution, see what is said in the explanation of Virgil's episode of Nisus and Euryalus, in sect. iv. of this book.

"help

" help me those Gods who are the avengers of per-
" jury *."

Here we see, that after each man had sworn, *to defend and protect the religion of his country*, in consequence of the obligation the State lies under to protect the *established worship*, he concludes, *I will conform to it*; the directest and strongest of all *tests*.

But a test of conformity to the established worship, was not only required of those who bore a share in the civil administration, but of those too who were chosen to preside in their religious rites. Demosthenes hath recorded the oath which the priestesses of Bacchus, called Γεραιραὶ, took on entering into their Office. " I observe a religious chastity, and am clean and pure
" from all other defilements, and from conversation
" with man: AND I CELEBRATE THE THEOINEIA
" AND IOBACCHIA TO BACCHUS, ACCORDING TO
" THE ESTABLISHED RITES, AND AT THE PROPER
" SEASONS †."

Nor were the ROMANS less watchful for the support of the *established* religion, as may be seen by a speech of the consul Posthumius in Livy, occasioned

* Οὐ καλαισχυνῶ ὅπλα τὰ ἱερὰ, οὐδ' ἐγκαλαλείψω τὸν παρατάτην ὅτῳ ἂν τοιχήσω· ΑΜΥΝΩ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΥΠΕΡ ΙΕΡΩΝ, καὶ ὑπὲρ ὁσίων καὶ μόνων, καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν. τὴν παλαίδα δὲ οὐκ ἐλάσσω παραδώσω, πλείω δὲ καὶ ἀρείω, ὥσην ἂν παραδέξωμαι· καὶ εὐηκοήσω τῶν ἀεὶ κρινόντων ἐμφρόνως, καὶ τοῖς θεσμοῖς τοῖς ἰδρυμένοις πείσωμαι, καὶ ὅς τινας ἂν ἄλλης τὸ πλῆθος ἰδρύσηται ὁμοφρόνως· καὶ ἄν τις ἀναιρῇ τοὺς θεσμοὺς ἢ μὴ πείθηται, οὐκ ὑπιδέψω, ἀμυνῶ δὲ καὶ μόνος, καὶ μετὰ πάντων· καὶ ΙΕΡΑ ΤΑ ΠΑΤΡΙΑ ΤΙΜΗΣΩ· ἴστορες Θεοὶ τούτων. Joan. Stobæi *de Rep. Serm.* xli. p. 243, Lugd. Ed. 1608.

† Ἁγιστεύω, καὶ εἰμὶ καθαρὰ, καὶ ἀγνὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ὁ καθαρευόντων, καὶ ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς συνουσίας, καὶ τὰ Θεοίνια, καὶ Ἰοβακχεῖα γεραίρω τῷ Διονύσῳ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑ ΠΑΤΡΙΑ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις. *Orat. cont. Neæram.*

by some horrid abuses committed, through the clandestine exercise of foreign worship. "How often, says he, "in the times of our fathers and forefathers, hath this "affair been recommended to the Magistrates; to "prohibit all foreign worship; to drive the priests and "sacrifices from the cirque, the forum, and the city; "to search up, and burn books of prophecies; and to "abolish all modes of sacrificing, differing from the "Roman discipline? For those sage and prudent men, "instructed in all kind of divine and human laws, "rightly judged that nothing tended so much to "overthrow religion, as when men celebrated the "sacred rites, not after their own, but foreign "customs *."

But when I say all regular policied states had an *established religion*, I mean no more than *he* would do, who, deducing Society from its true original, should, in order to persuade men of the benefits it produceth, affirm that all nations had a civil policy. For, as this writer could not be supposed to mean that every one constituted a free State, on the principles of public liberty (which yet was the only Society he proposed to prove was founded on truth, and productive of public good) because it is notorious, that the far greater part of civil policies are founded on different principles, and abused to different ends; so neither would I be understood to mean, when I say all nations

* Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium est magistratibus datum, ut sacra externa sieri vetarent; sacrificulos, vatesque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent; vaticinos libros conquirerent, comburerentque; omnem disciplinam sacrificandi, præterquam more Romano, abolerent? Judicabant enim prudentissimi viri omnis divini humanique juris, nihil æque dissolvendæ religionis esse, quam ubi non patrio, sed externo ritu sacrificaretur. Hist. lib. xxxix.

concurred

concurred in making this UNION, that they all exactly *discriminated the natures*, and fairly *adjusted the rights* of BOTH SOCIETIES, on the principles here laid down; though an ESTABLISHMENT resulting from this discrimination and adjustment, be the only one I would be supposed to recommend. On the contrary, I know this *union* hath been generally made on mistaken principles; or, if not so, hath degenerated by length of time. And, as it was sufficient for that writer's purpose, that those Societies, good or bad, proved the sense, all men had of the benefits resulting from civil policy in general, though they were oft mistaken in the application; so it is sufficient for *ours*, that this universal *concurrence* in the TWO SOCIETIES TO UNITE, shews the sense of mankind concerning the *utility* of such union. And lastly, as that writer's principles are not the less true on account of the general deviation from them in forming civil Societies; so may not ours, though so few states have suffered themselves to be directed by them in *practice*, nor any man, before, delivered them in *speculation*.

Such then is the *Theory* here offered to the world; of which, whoever would see a full account, and the several parts cleared from objections, may consult the treatise mentioned before, intitled, *The Alliance between Church and State:* in which we pretend to have discovered a plain and simple truth, of the highest concernment to civil Society, long lost and hid under the learned obscurity arising from the collision of contrary false principles.

BUT it is now time to proceed with our main subject. We have here given a short account of the true nature of the *Alliance between Church and State*; both to

justify the conduct of the ancient Lawgivers in establishing religion; and to shew the infinite service of this institution to civil Society. Another use of it may be the gaining an exacter knowledge of the *nature* of the established religions in the *pagan world:* for, having the true *theory* of an Establishment, it serves as a straight line to discover all the obliquities to which it is applied.

I shall therefore consider the *causes*, which facilitated the *establishment of religion* in the ancient world: and likewise *those* causes which prevented the *establishment* from receiving its due form.

I. Ancient pagan religion consisted in the worship of local tutelary Deities; which, generally speaking, were supposed to be the authors of their civil Institutes. The consequence of this was, that the *State*, as well as *particulars*, was the SUBJECT of religion. So that this religion could not but be *national and established*; that is, protected and encouraged by the civil Power. For how could that religion, which had the *national God* for its *object*; and the *State*, as an artificial man, for its *subject*, be other than *national* and *established?*

II. But then these very things, which so much promoted an *established religion*, prevented the union's being made upon a just and equitable footing. 1. By giving a wrong *idea* of *civil Society*. 2. By not giving a right *form* to the *religious*.

1. It is nothing strange, that the ancients should have a wrong idea of *civil Society*; and should suppose it ordained for the cognizance of *religious*, as well as of *civil* matters, while they believed in a local tutelary Deity, by whose direction they were formed into Community;

Community; and while they held, that Society, as such, was the *subject* of religion, contrary to what has been shewn above, that the *civil* Society's offer of a voluntary alliance with the *religious*, proceeded from its having no power in itself to inforce the influence of religion to the service of the State.

2. If their *religion* constituted a proper Society, it was yet a Society dependent on the State, and therefore not *sovereign*. Now it appears that no voluntary alliance can be made, but between two independent sovereign Societies. But, in reality, Pagan religion did not constitute any Society at all. For it is to be observed, that the unity of the object of faith, and conformity to a formula of dogmatic theology, as the terms of communion, are the great foundation and bond of a religious Society*. Now these things were wanting in the several national religions of Paganism: in which there was only a conformity in public Ceremonies. The *national Pagan* religion therefore did not properly compose a *Society*; nor do we find by Antiquity, that it was ever considered under that idea; but only as *part of the State*; and in that view, indeed, had its particular Societies and Companies, such as the colleges of Priests and Prophets.

These were such errors and defects as destroyed much of the utility, which results from *religious Establishments*, placed upon a right bottom. But yet *religious Establishments* they were; and, notwithstanding all their imperfections, served for many good purposes: such as *preserving the being of Religion:—bestowing additional veneration on the person of the Magistrate, and on the laws of the State:—giving*

* See The Alliance between Church and State, Book I. Ch. 5.

the

the Magistrate the right of applying the civil efficacy of religion:—and giving Religion a coactive power for the reformation of manners. And thus much for ESTABLISHMENTS.

SECT. VI.

THE last instance to be assigned of the Magistrate's care of religion, shall be that universal practice, in the ancient world, of religious TOLERATION; or the permitting the free exercise of all religions, how different soever from the *National* and *Established.* For though the very nature and terms of an *Established* religion implied the Magistrate's peculiar favour and protection; and though in fact, they had their *Test-laws* for its support, wherever there was diversity of worship; yet it was ancient policy to allow a large and full TOLERATION. And even in the *extent* of this allowance they seem generally to have had juster notions than certain of our modern Advocates for religious Liberty. They had no conception that any one should be indulged in his presumption of extending it to *Religious Rites and practices hurtful to Society, or dishonourable to Humanity.* There are many examples in Antiquity of this sage restriction. I shall only mention the universal concurrence in punishing *Magical Rites*, by which the health and safety of particulars were supposed to be injuriously affected. And Suetonius's burning the sacred grove in Anglesea*, in

* — "Præsidium posthac impositum victis, excisique Luci, SÆVIS superstitionibus sacri. Nam cruore captivo adolere aras, et hominum fibris consulere deos fas habebant." Tac. Ann. l. xiv. c. 30. —— *Superstition* amongst the Greeks and Romans had

in which human sacrifices were offered up by the Druids, was but the beginning of what those modern Advocates, above mentioned, would call a *Persecution* against the Order itself, whose obstinate perseverance in this infernal practice could not be overcome but by their total extirpation.

Two principal causes induced the *ancient Lawgivers* to the sage and reasonable conduct of a large and full toleration:

I. They considered that Religion seldom or never makes *a real impression* on the minds of those who are *forced* into a profession of it: and yet, that all the service Religion can do to the State, is by working that *real impression**. They concluded, therefore, that the profession of Religion should be FREE.

Hence may be understood the strange blindness of those *modern Politicians*, who expect to benefit the State by forcing men to outward conformity; which only making hypocrites and atheists, destroys the sole means religion hath of serving the State. But here, by a common fate of Politicians, they fell from one blunder into another. For having first, in a tyrannical adherence to their own scheme of Policy, or superstitious fondness for the established System of Worship, infringed upon religious Liberty; and then beginning to

had its free course. But the *sævæ superstitiones*, the *savage and cruel Rites*, injurious and dishonourable to human nature and civil Society, were rigorously forbidden.

* In specie autem fictæ simulationis, sicut reliquæ virtutes, ita PIETAS inesse non potest; cum qua simul et sanctitatem et religionem tolli necesse est: quibus sublatis, perturbatio vitæ sequitur et magna confusio. Atque haud scio, an PIETATE adversus deos sublata fides etiam, et societas humani generis, et una excellentissima virtus, justitia tollatur. Cic. De nat. deor. l. i. c. 2.

to find, that diversity of Sects was hurtful to the State, as it always will be, while the rights of Religion are violated; instead of repairing the mistake, and restoring religious Liberty, which would have stifled this pullulating evil in the seed, by affording it no further nourishment, they took the other course; and endeavoured, by a thorough discipline of *Conformity*, violently to rend it away; and with it they rooted up and destroyed all that good to Society, which so naturally springs from Religion, when it hath once taken fast hold of the human mind.

II. This was the most legitimate principle they went upon, and had the most lasting effect. They had another, which, though less ingenuous, was of more immediate influence; and this was the keeping up the warmth and vigour of religious impressions, by the introduction and toleration of new Religions and foreign Worship. For they supposed that "piety "and virtue then chiefly influence the mind, while "men are busied in the performance of religious "Rites and Ceremonies*;" as Tully observes, in the words of Pythagoras, the most celebrated of the pagan Lawgivers. Nor does this at all contradict the Roman maxim, as delivered by Posthumius in Livy [see p. 294.] For *that* maxim relates to *public Religion*, or the Religion of the State; *this* concerns *private Religion*, or the religion of Particulars. Now vulgar Paganism being not only false, but highly absurd, as having its foundation solely in the fancy and the passions; variety of Worships was necessary to suit

* — Siquidem et illud bene dictum est a Pythagora, doctissimo viro, tum maxime et pietatem et religionem versari in animis, cum rebus divinis operam daremus. De Leg. l. ii. c. 11.

every

every one's taste and humour. The genius of it disposing its followers to be inconstant, capricious, and fond of novelties; weary of long-worn Ceremonies, and immoderately fond of new. And in effect we see, amongst the same people, notwithstanding the universal notion of tutelary Deities, that, in *this* age, one God or mode of worship, in *that*, another mode had the vogue. And every new God, or new ceremony, rekindled the languid fire of Superstition: just as in modern Rome, every last Saint draws the Multitude to his shrine.

For, here it is to be observed, that in the Pagan world, a *tolerated Religion* did not imply *dissention* from the *established*, according to our modern ideas of *toleration*. Nor indeed could it, according to the general nature and genius of ancient Idolatry. *Tolerated* Religions there are rather subservient to the *established*, or supernumeraries of it, than in opposition to it. But then they were far from being on a footing with the *established*, or partakers of its privileges.

But men going into Antiquity under the impression of modern ideas, must needs form very inaccurate judgements of what they find. So, in this case, because few *tolerated Religions* are to be met with in Paganism, according to our sense of *toleration*, which is the allowance of a Religion OPPOSED to the *national*; and consequently, because no one is watched with that vigilance which ours demand, but all used with more indulgence than a Religion, reprobating the *established*, can pretend to; on this account, I say, a false opinion hath prevailed, that, *in the Pagan world, all kinds of Religion were upon an equal footing, with regard to the State*. Hence, we hear a noble Writer perpetually

perpetually applauding * *wise* Antiquity, for the full and free liberty it granted in matters of Religion, so agreeable to the principles of truth and public utility; and perpetually arraigning the UNSOCIABLE HUMOUR OF CHRISTIANITY for the contrary practice; which, therefore, he would insinuate, was built on contrary principles.

On this account, it will not be improper to consider a little, the genius of Paganism, as it is opposed to, what we call, *true Religion:* Which will shew us how easily the civil Magistrate brought about that Toleration, which he had such great *reasons of State* to promote; and at the same time, teach these objectors to know, that the good effect of this general tolerance, as far as the genius of Religion was concerned in its promotion, was owing to the egregious falsehood and absurdity of Paganism: and that, on the other hand, the evil effects of intolerance under the Christian religion, proceeded from its truth and perfection; not the natural consequence, as these men would insinuate, of a *false* Principle, but the abuse of a *true* one.

Ancient Paganism was an aggregate of several distinct Religions, derived from so many pretended revelations. Why it abounded in these, proceeded, in part, from the great number of Gods of human invention. As these Religions were not laid on the foundation, so neither were they raised on the destruction of one another. *They were not laid on the foundation of one another;* because, having given to their Gods, as local tutelary Deities †, contrary natures and dispositions, and distinct and separate interests, each God set up, on his own bottom, and held

* See the Characteristics, passim.

† See note [GG] at the end of this Book.

little in common with the rest*. *They were not raised on the destruction of one another*; because, as hath been observed, the several Religions of Paganism did not consist in matters of belief, and dogmatic theology, in which, where there is a contrariety, Religions destroy one another; but in matters of practice, in Rites and Ceremonies; and in these, a contrariety did no harm: For having given their Gods different natures and interests, where was the wonder if they clashed in their commanded Rites; or if their worshippers should think this no mark of their false pretensions?

These were horrible defects in the very essence of Pagan theology: and yet from these would necessarily arise *an universal toleration:* for each Religion admitting the other's pretensions, there must needs be a perfect harmony and INTERCOMMUNITY amongst them. Julian makes this the distinguishing character of the pagan Religion. For the imperial Sophist, writing to the people of Alexandria, and upbraiding them for having forsaken the religion of their country, in order to aggravate the charge, insinuates them to be guilty of ingratitude, as having forgotten those happy times when *all Egypt worshipped the Gods* IN COMMON,— οὐ γὰρ εἰσέρχεσθαι μνήμην τῆς παλαιᾶς ὑμᾶς ἐκείνης εὐδαιμονίας, ἡνίκα ἦν ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ μὲν πρὸς Θεὸς Αἰγύπτῳ τῇ πάσῃ, πολλῶν δὲ ἀπελαύομεν ἀγαθῶν. And, in his book against the Christian Religion, he says, there were but two commands in the Decalogue, that were peculiar to the Jews, and which the Pagans would not own to be reasonable, namely, the observation of the Sabbath, and the *having no other Gods but the*

* See note [HH] at the end of this Book.

Creator

Creator of all things. Ποῖον ἔθνος ἐστὶ (says he) πρὸς τῶν Θεῶν ἔξω τοῦ, Οὐ προσκυνήσεις Θεοῖς ἑτέροις, καὶ τοῦ, Μνήσθητι τῶν σαββάτων, ὃ μὴ τὰς ἄλλας οἵας χρῆναι φυλάττειν ἐνολάς *. The first Cause of all things, we see, was acknowledged by the Gentile Sages: what stuck with them was the not worshipping other Gods IN COMMON.——For according to the genius of Paganism, as here explained, no room was left for any other disputes, but whose God was most powerful; except where, by accident, it became a question, between two nations inhabiting the same country, who was truly the TUTELAR Deity of the place. As once we are told happened in Egypt, and broke out into a religious war:

> Inde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum
> Odit uterque locus, cum SOLOS CREDIT HABENDOS
> Esse deos, quos ipse colit †.

Here the question was not, which of the two worshipped a Phantom, and which a God, but whose God was the *tutelar* God of the place. Yet to insult the *tutelar* Gods of the place was a thing so rare, and deemed so prodigious, that Herodotus thinks it a clear proof of Cambyses's incurable madness that he outraged the Religion of Egypt, by stabbing their God Apis and turning their monkey Deities into ridicule ‡. Notwithstanding a late noble writer, from this account of Juvenal, would persuade us §, that *intolerance* was of the very nature and genius of the Egyptian theo-

* Ap. S. Cyril. cont. Julian. l. v.

† Juvenal, Sat. xv.

‡ Καμβύσης δὲ, ὡς λέγουσι Αἰγύπτιοι, διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἀδίκημα αὐτίκα ἐμάνη, ἐὼν ἐδὲ πρότερον φρενήρης. Thalia, c. 30. *in initio.*

§ Characteristics, vol. iii. Miscel. 2.

logy,

logy, from whence all Paganism arose. "The com-
"mon heathen religion (says he) was supported
"chiefly from that sort of enthusiasm, which is raised
"from the external objects of grandeur, majesty, and
"what we call august. On the other hand, the Egyp-
"tian OR SYRIAN religions, which lay most in mystery
"and concealed rights, *having less dependance on the*
"*Magistrate*, and less of that decorum of art, po-
"liteness, and magnificence, ran into a more pusilla-
"nimous, frivolous, and mean kind of superstition;
"the observance of days, the forbearance of meats,
"and the contention about traditions, seniority of
"laws, and priority of godships.

- - - - - - - "Summus utrimque
"Inde furor vulgo *," &c.

Well might he say, he suspected "that it would be
"urged against him, that he talked at random and
"*without book* †." For the very contrary of every thing he here says, is the truth. And his supposing the Egyptian and Syrian religions had less dependence on the Magistrate than the Roman; and that the Egyptian, and *Syrian* (as he is pleased to call the *Jewish*) were the same, or of a like genius, is such an instance of his knowledge or ingenuity, as is not easily to be equalled. However, since the noble writer hath made such use of the Satirist's relation, as to insinuate that the Ombites and Tentyrites acted in the common spirit and genius of the Egyptian theology, and became the model of *intolerance* to the Jewish and Christian world, it may not be amiss to explain the true original of these religious squabbles, as Antiquity itself hath

* Vol. III. p. 41. † P. 82.

told the story: whereby it will appear, they had their birth from a very particular and occasional fetch of civil policy, which had no dependence on the general Superstition of the Pagan world.

The instance stands almost single in Antiquity. This would incline one to think that it arose from no common principle: and if we enquire into the *nature* of the Egyptian theology, it will appear impossible to come from *that*. For the common notion of local and tutelary deities, which prevents all *intolerance*, was originally, and peculiarly, Egyptian, as will be seen hereafter. It may then be asked how this mischief came about? I believe a passage in Diodorus Siculus, as quoted by Eusebius, will inform us. A certain king of Egypt, finding some cities in his dominions apt to plot and cabal against him, contrived to introduce the distinct worship of a different animal into each city; as knowing that a reverence for their own, and a neglect of all others, would soon proceed to an EXCLUSION; and so bring on such a mutual aversion, as would never suffer them to unite in one common design. Thus, was there at first as little of a *religious war on the principles of intolerance* in this affair of the Ombites and Tentyrites, as in a drunken squabble between two trading Companies in the Church of Rome about their patron saints. But Diodorus deserves to be heard in his own words: who, when he had delivered the fabulous accounts of the original of brute-worship, subjoins that which he supposed to be the true. "But some give another original of the "worship of brute animals: for the several cities "being formerly prone to rebellion, and to enter into "conspiracies against Monarchical government, one "of their Kings contrived to introduce into each city

" the worship of a different animal: so that while " every one reverenced the Deity which itself held " sacred, and despised what another had consecrated; " they could hardly be brought to join cordially toge- " ther in one common design, to the disturbance of " the Government *."

But to return: such then was the root and foundation of this SOCIABILITY of Religion in the ancient world, so much envied by modern Pagans. The effect of their absurdities, as *Religions*; and of their imperfections, as *Societies*. Yet had universal custom made this principle of INTERCOMMUNITY, so essential to Paganism, that when their Philosophers and men of

* Αἰτίας δὲ καὶ ἄλλας φασί τινες τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων τιμῆς· τῷ γὰρ πλήθει τὸ παλαιὸν ἀφισαμένῳ τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ συμφρονῆσαι εἰς τὸ μηκέτι βασιλεύεσθαι, ἐπινοῆσαί τινα διάφορα σεβάσματα αὐτοῖς τῶν ζώων παρασχεῖν, ὅπως ἑκάστων τὸ μὲν παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμενον σεβομένων· τῷ δὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀφιερωμένῳ καταφρονοῦντι, μηδέποτε ὁμονοῆσαι δύνασθαι πάντες οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον. Euseb. Præp. Evang. p. 32. ed. Rob. Steph. Plutarch gives us an account of another of these squabbles (if indeed it was not the same with Juvenal's) which happened much about the same time, between the Oxyrynchitæ and the Cynopolitæ; and confirms what is here said of the original of this mutual hatred—"Αλλοι δὲ τῶνδε τῶν δεινῶν τινα καὶ πανέργων βασιλέων ἱστοροῦσι, τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους καταμαθόντα τῇ μὲν φύσει κόφους καὶ πρὸς μεταβολὴν καὶ νεωτερισμὸν ὀξυῤῥόπους ὄντας, ἄμαχον δὲ καὶ δυσκάθεκτον ὑπὸ πλήθους δύναμιν ἐν τῷ σωφρονεῖν καὶ κοινοπραγεῖν ἔχοντας, ἀίδιον αὐτοῖς ἐν καταστροφῇ διέξοδον δεισιδαιμονίαν διαφορᾶς ἀπαύστου πρόφασιν· τῶν γὰρ θηρίων ἃ προσέταξεν ἄλλοις ἄλλα τιμᾶν καὶ σέβεσθαι δυσμενῶς καὶ πολεμικῶς ἀλλήλοις προσφερομένων, καὶ τροφὴν ἑτέραν ἑτέρας προσίεσθαι πεφυκότας, ἀμύνοντας, ἀεὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις ἕκαστον καὶ χαλεπῶς ἀδικουμένους φέροντες, ἐλάνθανον τὴν τῶν θηρίων ἔχθρας συνελκόμενοι καὶ συνεκπολεμούμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους· μόνοι γὰρ ἔτι νῦν Αἰγυπτίων Λυκοπολῖται πρόβατον ἐσθίουσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ λύκον, ὃν θεὸν νομίζουσιν· οἱ δὲ Ὀξυρυγχῖται καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν Κυνοπολιτῶν τὸν ὀξύρυγχον ἰχθὺν ἐσθιόντων, κύνας συλλαβόντες καὶ θύσαντες, ὡς ἱερεῖον καθέφαγον· ἐκ δὲ τούτου καταγάντες εἰς πόλεμον, ἀλλήλους τὴν διαθήκην κακῶς, καὶ ὕστερον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων κολαζόμενοι διελύθησαν. Περὶ ΙΣ. καὶ ΟΣ. 676, 677, Steph. ed.

learning, on the spreading of Christianity, were become ashamed of the grossness of Polytheism, and had so refined it by allegorical interpretations of their Mythology, as to make the several Pagan deities but the various attributes of the one only God; they still adhered to their darling principle (for Paganism still continued to be without a dogmatic theology, or formulary of faith) and contended, that this diversity was harmony, a musical discord, well pleasing to the God of heaven and earth. "It is but reasonable for us "(says Symmachus*) to suppose, that it is one and "the same BEING whom all mankind adores. We "behold the same stars; we live under the influence "of one common heaven; we are incompassed by "the same universe. What matters it, what device "each man uses in his search after truth? ONE road "is plainly too narrow to lead us into the initiation "of so GRAND A MYSTERY." Elegantly alluding to the *secret* of the *greater Mysteries*, where, after the History of the Popular theogony had been delivered to the Initiated, the orphic Hymn, revealing the doctrine of the *Unity*, concluded the entertainment. "The "great lord and governor of the earth (says Themistius) "seems to be delighted with these diversities of Re-"ligions. It is his Will that the Syrians worship him "one way, the Greeks another, and the Egyptians "yet another†." The reader sees that the foundation

* Æquum est, quicquid omnes colunt unum putari; eadem spectamus astra; commune cœlum est; idem nos mundus involvit: *Quid interest quâ quisque prudentiâ verum requirat?* UNO *itinere non potest perveniri ad tam* GRANDE SECRETUM, Lib. x. Ep. 61. *ad Valent. Theod. et Arcad. Augg.*

† Ταύτῃ νόμιζε γάνυσθαι τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τὸν τῶ παντὸς Ἀρχηγέτην· ἄλλως Σύρες ἐθέλει θρησκεύειν, ἄλλως Ἕλληνας, ἄλλως Αἰγυπτίους. Orat. XII.

of

of this way of thinking, was the old principle of *inter-community* in the worship of local tutelary Deities. But, what is remarkable, it appears even to this day, to be essential to Paganism. Bernier tells us, that the Gentiles of Hindoustan defended their religion against him in this manner: "They gave me (says he) this "pleasant answer; that they did not at all pretend that "their Law was universal—that they did not in the "least suspect that *ours* was false: it might, for what "they knew, be a good Law for us, and that GOD "MAY HAVE MADE MANY DIFFERENT ROADS TO "LEAD TO HEAVEN; but they would by no means "hear that *ours* was general for the whole world, and "*theirs* a mere fable and invention *." Bernier indeed speaks of this as a peculiar whimsey, which had entered the head of his Brachman. But had he been as conversant in history and Antiquity, as he was in modern philosophy, he would have known that this was a principle which accompanied Paganism through all its stages.

Let us now see the nature and genius of those Religions which were founded, as we say, in TRUE REVELATION. The first is the JEWISH; in which was taught the belief of one God, the Maker and Governor of all things, in contradistinction to all the false gods of the Gentiles: This necessarily introduced a DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. So that the followers of this Religion, if they believed it true, in the sense it was delivered to them, must needs believe all others to be false. But it being instituted only for themselves, they had, *directly*, no further to do with that falsehood, than to guard themselves against the contagion of it, by

* See note [II] at the end of this Book.

holding no fellowship or communion with the Gentiles.

Yet so strong was this general prejudice of INTERCOMMUNITY, that all the provisions of the Law could not keep this brutal people from running into the idolatries of the Nations: For their frequent defections, till after the Babylonian Captivity, were no other than the joining foreign Worship to the Worship of the God of Israel.

After this Religion, comes the CHRISTIAN, which taught the belief of the same God, the supreme Cause of all things: and being a Revelation, like the other, from Heaven, must needs be built upon that *other*; or at least on the supposition of its truth. And, as this latter was not national, like the other, but given to all mankind, for that reason, but especially for some others, which will be fully considered in their place, it had a MORE COMPLETE system of dogmatic theology. The consequence of this was, that its followers must not only think Paganism false, and Judaism abolished, and so refuse all fellowship and communion with both; but must endeavour to propagate their Religion throughout the world, on the destruction of all the rest. And their dogmatic theology teaching them that TRUTH (and not UTILITY *, as the Pagans, who had only public Rites and Ceremonies, supposed) was the end of Religion; it was no wonder, their aversion to *falsehood* should be proportionably increased. And so far all was right. But this aversion, cherished by piety, unhappily produced a blind, ungovernable zeal; which, when arguments failed, hurried them on to all

* For this the reader may see Dion. Halicarnasseus's discourse of the religion which Romulus introduced in his republic; and for his reason, see Books III. and IV.

the

the unlawful use of force and compulsion. Hence the evils of PERSECUTION, and the violation of the laws of humanity, in a fond passion for propagating the Law of GOD *.

This is a true representation of the state of things, both in the Pagan, and in the Believing world. To give it the utmost evidence, we will next consider the reception true Religion met with amongst idolaters.

The Pagan world having early imbibed this inveterate prejudice concerning *intercommunity of worship*, men were but too much accustomed to new Revelations, when the JEWISH appeared, not to acknowledge its superior pretences. Accordingly we find by the history of this People, that it was esteemed a *true one* by its neighbours. And therefore they proceeded, in their usual way, to join it, on occasion, to their own: as those did, whom the king of Assyria sent into the cities of Israel in the place of the ten Tribes. Whereby it happened (so great was the influence of this Principle) that in the same time and country, the Jews of Jerusalem added the Pagan idolatries to their Religion; while the Pagans of Samaria added the Jewish religion to their idolatries.

But when this people of God, in consequence of having their *dogmatic Theology* more carefully inculcated to them after their return from the Captivity, became rigid in pretending not only that their Religion was true, but the only true one; then it was, that they began to be treated by their Neighbours, and afterwards by the Greeks and Romans, with the utmost hatred and contempt for this THEIR INHUMANITY AND UNSOCIABLE TEMPER. To this cause alone we

* See note [KK] at the end of this Book.

are to ascribe all that spleen and rancour which appears in the histories of these latter Nations, concerning them. Celsus fairly reveals what lay at bottom, and speaks out, for them all: "If the Jews, on these accounts, adhere to their own Law, it is not for *that* "they are to blame: I rather blame those who forsake "their own country religion to embrace the Jewish. "But if these People give themselves airs of sublimer "wisdom than the rest of the world, and on that "score refuse all COMMUNION with it, as not equally "pure;—I must tell them that it is not to be believed "that they are more dear, or agreeable to God, than "other nations *." Hence, amongst the Pagans, the Hebrew People came to be distinguished from all others by the name of GENUS HOMINUM INVISUM DEIS †, and with good reason ‡.

This was the reception the Jews met with in the world: but not pretending to obtrude their Religion on the rest of mankind, as it was given properly to the Posterity of Abraham, they yet, for the most part, escaped persecution.

When CHRISTIANITY arose, though on the foundation of Judaism, it was at first received with great complacency by the Pagan world. For they were such utter strangers to the idea of one Religion's being built, or dependent on another, that it was a long time before they knew this connection between them.

* Εἰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ ταῦτα περιςέλλοιεν Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν ἴδιον νόμον, ἀ μεμπλὰ αὐτῶν· ἐκείνων δὲ μᾶλλον τῶν καλαλιπόνλων τὰ σφέτερα, καὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίων περισποιουμένων· εἰ δ' ὥς τι σοφώτερον εἰδότες σεμνύνονλαί τε, καὶ τὴν ἄλλων κοινωνίαν ἐκ ἐξ ἴσου καθαρῶν ἀποςρέφονλαι — ἀ μὴν ἀδ' εὐδοκιμεῖν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τέργεσθαι διαφόρως τι τῶν ἄλλων τέτους εἰκός. Orig. cont. Celsum, l. v. p. 259.

† Tacit. Hist. l. v. ‡ See note [RR] at the end.

Even

Even Celsus himself, with all his sufficiency, saw so little how this matter stood, that he was not satisfied whether the Jews and Christians worshipped the same God;—was sometimes inclined to think they did not. This ignorance, which the propagators of our Religion were not too forward to remove *, for fear of hindering the progress of the Gospel, prevented the prejudice which the Pagans had to Judaism, from indisposing them to Christianity. So that the Gospel was favourably heard. And the superior evidence, with which it was inforced, inclined men, long habituated to pretended Revelations, to receive it into the number of the Established. Accordingly we find one Roman emperor introducing it amongst his closet Religions †; and another proposing to the Senate ‡, to give it a more public entertainment §. But when it was found to carry its pretensions higher ‖, and to claim, like the Jewish, the title of the ONLY TRUE ONE, then it was that it began to incur the same hatred and contempt with the Jewish. But when it went still further, and urged a necessity for all men to forsake their national Religions, and embrace the Gospel, this so shocked ¶ the Pagans, that it soon brought upon itself the bloody storms which followed. Thus you have the true origin of *persecution for Religion* (though not of the *intolerant principle*, as we shall see before we come to the end

* See note [LL] at the end of this Book.

† Alexander Severus. Lampridii, c. 29.

‡ Tiberius retulit ad senatum ut INTER CETERA SACRA reciperetur. Hier. See note [MM] at the end of this Book.

§ See note [NN] at the end of this Book.

‖ See note [OO] at the end of this Book.

¶ See note [PP] at the end of this Book.

of

of this section). A persecution not committed, but undergone, by the Christian Church.

Hence we see how it happened, that such good Emperors as Trajan and M. Antonine came to be found in the first rank of persecutors. A difficulty that hath very much embarrassed the enquirers into ecclesiastical antiquity; and given a handle to the Deists, who empoison every thing, of pretending to suspect that there must be something very much amiss in primitive Christianity, while such wise magistrates could become its persecutors. But now the reason is manifest*: the Christian pretences overthrew a fundamental principle of Paganism, which they thought founded in nature; namely, *the friendly intercommunity of worship.* And thus the famous passage of Pliny the younger becomes intelligible. "For I did not in "the least hesitate, but that whatever should appear "on confession, to be their faith, yet that their fro-"wardness and *inflexible obstinacy* would certainly "deserve punishment†." What was this *inflexible obstinacy?* It could not consist in professing a *new Religion:* that was a thing common enough. It was the refusing all communion with Paganism; refusing to throw a grain of incense on their altars. For we must not think, as is commonly imagined, that this was at first enforced by the Magistrate to make them renounce their Religion: but only to give a *test* of its *social and hospitable* temper. It was indeed, and rightly, understood by the Christians to be a renouncing of their Religion; and so, accordingly, abstained from.

* See note [QQ] at the end of this Book.

† Neque enim dubitabam, *qualecunque esset* quod faterentur, certe, pertinaciam et *inflexibilem obstinationem* debere puniri. Lib. x. Ep. 97.

The

The misfortune was, that the Pagans did not consider this *inflexibility* as a mere *error*, but as an *immorality* likewise. The *unsociable*, *uncommunicable* temper, in matters of religious worship, was esteemed by the best of them, as *a hatred and aversion to mankind.* Tacitus, speaking of the burning of Rome: "Haud "perinde in crimine incendii quam ODIO HUMANI "GENERIS convicti sunt* [Christiani]." *Convicted,* he says, *of hate to all mankind.* But how? The confession of the Pagans themselves, concerning the purity of the Christian morals, shews this could be no other than a *conviction* of their rejecting all *intercommunity of Worship*; which, so great was their prejudice, they thought could proceed from nothing but *hate to mankind.* The like character the same historian gives of the Jews: "Apud ipsos FIDES OBSTINATA, sed "adversus omnes alios HOSTILE ODIUM†." *Now the Jews and Christians* had nothing in common but this *unsociable and uncommunicable temper* in religious matters, this *obstinata fides* which gave so much offence to Paganism. We are not to imagine, these excellent Pagan moralists so blind as not to see all the merit of *a firm and fixed resolution of keeping a good conscience.* They did see and own it, as appears by the famous "Justum et tenacem propositi virum," &c. of one of their moral poets. But, unluckily for truth, they did not see the *pervicacia et inflexibilis obstinatio* of the Christians in that light. Though it was nothing more than such a *fixed resolution,* as one who most severely censured them for it, the good emperor Marcus Antoninus, fairly confesses. In his book of *Meditations,* speaking of a wise man's readiness to die, he says, "He

* Ann. xv. Sect. 44.

† See note [RR] at the end of this Book.

"should

" should be so prepared, that his readiness may be " seen to be the effect of a well-weighed judgment, " not of MERE OBSTINACY, like that of the Chris- " tians *." This is a very heavy charge on the primitive Martyrs. But he himself removes it in his Constitution to the *Community of Asia*, given us by Eusebius. " I know, says he, the Gods are watchful " to discover such sort of men. For it is much more " fit that they themselves should punish those who " REFUSE TO WORSHIP THEM, than that we should " interfere in it †." Why then was it called *mere obstinacy?* The reason is seen above: universal prejudice had made men regard a refusal of this *intercommunity* as the most brutal of all dissociability. And the emperor Julian, who understood this matter the best of any, fairly owns, that the Jews and Christians brought the execration of the world upon them by their aversion to the Gods of Paganism, and their refusal of all communication with them ‡.

On this occasion, it may not be improper, once for all, to expose the ignorance and malice of those, whom the French call PHILOSOPHERS, and we English, FREE-THINKERS; who, with no more knowledge of Antiquity, than what the *modern sense* of a few Latin and Greek words could afford them, have this *odium humani generis* perpetually in their mouths, to dis-

* See note [SS] at the end of this Book.

† Ἐγὼ μὲν οἶδ' ὅτι κ) τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπιμελές ἐστι μὴ λανθάνειν τὺς τοιύτες· πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐκεῖνοι κολάσαιεν ἂν τὺς μὴ βελομένυς αὐτὺς προσκυνεῖν ἢ ἡμεῖς. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. iv. c. 13.

‡ Ἀλλὰ τὸ, ὃ προσκυνήσεις θεοῖς ἑτέροις· ὃ δὴ μέγα τῆς περὶ τὸν Θεὸν φησι διαξυλῆς· Θεὸς γὰρ ζηλωλής φησι——ἄφελε τῦτον τὸν λῆρον, κ) μὴ τηλικαύτην ἐφ' ἡμᾶς αὐτὺς ἕλκειε βλασφημίαν. Apud Cyrill. cont. Jul. l. v.

grace

grace the chosen People of God, or rather the Author of their Religion. Their favourite author, Tacitus himself, by extending the abuse, discountenances it. He makes this *odium humani generis* the characteristic *both of Jews and Christians*; and by so doing, shews us, in what it consisted. Nor do the Ancients in general, by affixing it as the common brand to these two *inhospitable* Religions, contribute to this calumny, any otherwise than by the incapacity of our *Philosophers* to understand them. Diodorus Siculus, speaking * of Antiochus's profanation of the *Jewish Temple*, and his contemptuous destruction of the *Sacred Books*, applauds the Tyrant's exploits, as those Books contained τὰ μισόξενα νόμιμα, *Laws, which bore hate and enmity to all the rest of Mankind.* This pretended *odium humani generis*, we find then, was not any thing in the personal temper of the Jews, but in the nature and genius of their LAW. These Laws are extant and lie now before us; and we see, the only *hate* they contain is the *hate of Idols.* With regard to the *race of Mankind*, nothing can be more endearing than the Mosaic account of their *common original*; nothing more benign or salutary than the legal directions to the Jews concerning their treatment of all, *out of the* COVENANT. Whatever there might be of this *odious temper* fairly ascribed to the Jews, by our *Philosophers*, it received no countenance from the LAW, and is expressly condemned by the Almighty Author of it, when it betrayed itself amongst certain corrupt and apostate members of that Nation. These, indeed, the Prophet Isaiah describes, as saying to all others,—*Stand by thyself, come not near me; for I am holier*

* Eclog. I. ex Diod. Sic. l. 31.

than

than thou *. And lest this should be mistaken for the fruits of *the unhospitable genius of the Law*, he takes care to inform us that these men were the rankest and most abandoned Apostates.——*A rebellious People who sacrifice in gardens, and burn incense upon Altars of Brick——who remain amongst the graves, and lodge in the monuments, which eat swine's flesh* †, &c. that is, a People thoroughly paganized.

Thus have I endeavoured to explain the true origin of that universal TOLERATION (as far as Religion influenced it) under *Paganism*; and the accidental causes of its violation under *Christianity*. The account will be further useful to many considerable purposes, as will be seen hereafter. At present I shall only take notice how well it obviates one specious objection against Christianity. "If this Religion, say the Deists, were accompanied with such illustrious and extraordinary marks of truth, as is pretended; how happened it, that its truth was not seen by more of the best and wisest of those times? And if it were seen (as it certainly was), how could they continue Pagans?" The answer is easy. The conviction of the truth of a *new* Religion was not deemed a sufficient reason, by men, overrun with the general prejudice of INTERCOMMUNITY, to quit their *old* ones.

The case indeed was different in a Jew, who held none of this *intercommunity*. If such a one owned the truth of Christianity, he must needs embrace it. We conclude, therefore, that the passage of Josephus (who was as much a Jew as the Religion of Moses could make him) which acknowledges, *Jesus to be*

* Isai. lxv. 5. † Ver. 2, 3, 4.

THE

THE CHRIST *, is a rank forgery, and a very stupid one too †. But it hath been said, that Josephus was a *Jewish Convert*. If so, it must be *to* Judaism, and not *from* it. For where he affirms, against Apion, that *there ought to be but one Temple for one God* ‡, he speaks the very spirit of the LAW.

We have now seen the motives the civil Magistrate had to *tolerate*:—Of what nature that *toleration* was:—And how easily it was brought about.

But then, lest the People should abuse this right of worshipping according to their own will, to the detriment of the State, in private and clandestine conventicles (which right the Magistrate supported for the civil benefit of it), he took care that such worship should have the public approbation and allowance, before it was received on the footing of a *tolerated Religion*. So, by the laws of ATHENS, no *strange God*, nor *foreign Worship* was permitted, till approved and licensed by the Court of AREOPAGUS. This is the reason why St. Paul, who was regarded as the bringer in of *foreign Gods*, ΞΕΝΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ, was had up to that Tribunal. Not as a criminal §, but rather as a public benefactor, who had a *new Worship* to propose to a people, *religious above all others*, ΩΣ ΔΕΙΣΙΔΑΙΜΟΝΕΣΤΕΡΟΙ; most addicted, as Strabo tells us, to the recognition of *foreign Wor-*

* — Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ· εἴγε Ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή· ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής. Διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων, τῶν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων. —Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΗΝ.—Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν· τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτα, καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Antiq. xviii. 3. 3.

† See a further proof of it, Book V. sect. 4.

‡ Lib. II.

§ See note [TT] at the end of this Book.

ship;

ship *; and " of all the Greeks, as Julian observes, " most devoted to Religion, and most hospitable to " strangers †." Tully ‡ makes Solon the founder of this Court. But the Arundel marbles, and Plutarch in his life of that Lawgiver §, contradict this opinion; and the latter, in support of his own, quotes a law of Solon's, which makes mention of the Areopagus as already existing. The difficulty is how to reconcile these accounts. I imagine this might be the case: Solon, we know, was employed by the Athenians to new-model their Commonwealth, by reforming the ill Constitutions, and supplying such as were defective. So that in the number of his regulations, this might be one; The adding, to the Court of Areopagus, the peculiar jurisdiction in question; as of great moment to public utility. And having thus enlarged and ennobled its Jurisdiction, he was afterwards regarded as its founder. A passage in Æschylus seems, at first sight indeed, not to favour this opinion; but to insinuate, that this Jurisdiction was coëval with the Court. In the fifth act of his *Eumenides*, he makes the worship of the *Furies*, or the *venerable Goddesses*, as they were called, to be received and recognised in Athens, by a decree of Minerva, as head of the college of Areopagus, which the poet feigns she had just then instituted. But this plainly appears to have been contrived only for the sake of a poetical embellishment: and Æschylus seems to employ one circum-

* Ἀθηναῖοι ὲ ὥσπερ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλοξενώτατοι διαμένουσιν, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τὰς θεάς· πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν ξενικῶν ἱερῶν παρεδέξαντο. Geogr. l. x.

† —— ὡς καὶ φιλόθεοι μάλιστα πάντων εἰσὶ, καὶ δέξιοι πρὸς τὰς ξένας. Misopog.

‡ De Officiis, lib. i. c. 22.

§ Vitæ parall. vol. i. p. 194. edit. Bryan.

stance

stance in this scene, designedly to inform us of the order of time, in which the Court received its two different jurisdictions. It is, where he makes the *criminal* cause of Orestes, the first which was judged at that Tribunal; and the *religious* one, of the reception of the Eumenides, but the second. However this be, the Areopagus was, by far, the most formidable judicature in the republic. And it is observable, that Aristophanes, who spares neither the fleets, the armies, the Courts of justice, the person of the supreme Magistrate, the Assemblies of the people, or the Temples of the Gods themselves, does not dare to hazard the least injurious reflection on that venerable body.

The ROMANS had a law to the same purpose; which, as often as it was violated, was publicly vindicated by the authority of the State: as appears from the words of Posthumius in Livy, quoted in the last section: "Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium est "magistratibus datum, ut sacra externa fieri vetarent, "sacrificulos vatesque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent, "vaticinos libros conquirerent*?" &c. Which shews their care to have all *tolerated* religions under the Magistrate's inspection. And, if I am not much mistaken, Tully, in his *Book of Laws*, the substance of which is taken from the *Twelve tables*, gives us that very law; whereby, as we said, all foreign and clandestine worship, unauthorized by the civil magistrate, was forbid. SEPARATIM NEMO HABESSIT DEOS: NEVE NOVOS, NEVE ADVENAS, NISI PUBLICE ADSCITOS, PRIVATIM COLUNTO†. "No man shall "worship the Gods clandestinely, or have them se-

* Lib. xxxix. Hist.

† See note [UU] at the end of this Book.

" parately to himself: nor shall any new or foreign " God be worshipped by particulars, till such God " hath been legally approved of, and tolerated by the " magistrate." The comment, as concise, and consequently as obscure as the text, follows in these words: SUOSQUE DEOS, AUT NOVOS, AUT ALIENIGENAS COLI, CONFUSIONEM HABET RELIGIONUM, ET IGNOTAS CEREMONIAS: NON A SACERDOTIBUS, NON A PATRIBUS ACCEPTOS DEOS, ITA PLACERET COLI, SI HUIC LEGI PARUERANT IPSI *. " For " each man to have his Gods in peculiar, whether " *new* or *stranger* Gods, without public allowance, " tends to defeat and confound all religion, and intro- " duce clandestine worship: and had the priests and " our forefathers had a due regard to this law, we " should never have approved of that kind of worship " which we now pay to the Gods they introduced " amongst us."

But notwithstanding all this, Mr. Bayle, from the words above quoted from the speech of Posthumius in Livy, would persuade us †, that the Romans did not admit or tolerate foreign worship; and that the care of the Magistrate, there taken notice of by the Consul, was to prohibit all religions, but the *established:* an opinion which the whole Roman history discredits; where we find the Magistrate, from time to time, *tolerated* all foreign religions with the utmost facility. The care then, which Posthumius meant, was surely that of preventing all clandestine worship, unlicensed by the Magistrate: This appears even from that other passage brought by Mr. B. from Livy to support his assertion: " Nec corpora modo affecta tabo, sed

* See note [XX] at the end of this Book.

† Pens. div. c. 221.

" animos

" animos quoque multiplex religio et pleraque externa " invasit, novos ritus sacrificando, vaticinando *infe-* " *rentibus in domos, quibus quæstui* sunt capti super- " stitione animi *:" But more particularly from the very affair, Posthumius was here engaged in. At this juncture, the State was above measure exasperated by the monstrous enormities committed in the clandestine rites of Bacchus: yet it is observable, that in the edict passed in the very height of their resentment, the right of *toleration* was preserved inviolate: the Decree of the Senate forbidding " any celebration of the *Bac-* " *chanals* either in Rome or Italy. But that if any " one should be possessed with a belief that this sort " of rite was due by custom, and necessary; and that " he could not omit the celebration of it without " irreligion and impiety, he should lay his case before " the city Pretor; the Pretor should consult the " Senate, when there was not less than an hundred " in council, to know if they approved of it. These " cautions observed, the rites might be celebrated, " provided that not more than five assisted at the sa- " crifice, that they had no *common purse*, no *priest*, " nor a *master of the solemnities* †."

As here, the Magistrate's care, in expelling foreign religions, was to prevent clandestine worship amongst the *tolerated*; so at other times, the same care was

* Lib. iv. Hist.

† — Ne qua Bacchanalia Romæ, neve in Italia essent. Si quis tale sacrum solenne et necessarium duceret, nec sine religione et piaculo se id omittere posse apud Prætorem urbanum profiteretur; Prætor senatum consuleret, si ei permissum esset, quum in senatu centum non minus essent, ita id sacrum faceret, dum ne plus quinque sacrificio interessent, neu qua pecunia communis, neu quis magister sacrorum, aut sacerdos esset. Lib. xxxix.

employed in preventing those foreign religions from mixing with the *established*, as we are informed by Valerius Maximus*. But neither in that case, nor in this, was the liberty of *particulars*, to worship as they thought fit, at all infringed, or impaired.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus plainly distinguishes between their *established* and *tolerated* religions. The passage is curious; and will not only serve to confute Mr. B.'s notion, but will afford us an opportunity of explaining what is further necessary to clear up this embarrassed subject. The words of this diligent enquirer into the Roman Constitution are these: "What, above all things, raised my admiration was, "that, notwithstanding the vast multitudes which "throng from all parts to Rome, who must there, "consequently, worship their own country Gods, ac- "cording to their country rites; yet the city never "adopted any of these foreign worships into the PUBLIC "religion; as hath been the custom for many other "states to do†." Whence it appears, 1. That all strangers might freely worship in Rome according to their own way; the being debarred of that liberty, was not deemed, by him, a conceivable case: That such *particulars* as were so disposed, might join with them; and that, besides these *tolerated* religions, there was one *public*, and *established*, which admitted of no foreign mixtures. 2. We are not to understand the author as if his wonder was caused by the Romans having an *established* religion distinct from the *tolerated*;

* Lib. i. c. 3.

† Καὶ ὃ πάνλων μάλιστα ἔγωγε τεθαύμακα, καίπερ μυρίων ὅσων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπεληλυθότων ἐθνῶν, οἷς πολλὴ ἀνάγκη σέβειν τὰς πατρίους θεὰς τοῖς οἴκοθεν νομίμοις, ἐδενὸς εἰς ζῆλον ἐλήλυθε τῶν ξενικῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἡ πόλις δημοσίᾳ, ὃ πολλοῖς ἤδη συνέβη παθεῖν. Antiq. lib. II.

but,

but, for that they mixed, or introduced into the *established* few or no foreign rites; which was the custom in the cities of Greece: for these are the *other states*, which the historian hints at. But modern writers not adverting to this, when they read of the Roman practice of admitting no *foreign* worship into their *public* religion, concluded wrongly, that they allowed no *toleration:* and when they read of the Greek practice of naturalizing *foreign* religions, by adopting them into their public worship, concluded, as wrongly, that they had no *establishments*. 3. The words Η ΠΟΛΙΣ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ, are remarkable: He does not say, the city rejected foreign worship, but, that it admitted not of it PUBLICLY; that is, did not bring it into the *public* religion of the State. For, as we observed before, Paganism had two parts, the one public, the other private: the *State*, as such, was the subject of the one; and *Particulars*, as such, of the other. But they admitted of foreign rites *privately*; that is, allowed *particulars* to use them, after the Magistrate's licence had been obtained for that purpose. So that the *established* religion, every where, related to the *public* part of Paganism; and the *tolerated*, to the *private* part. 4. The historian observes, that, in this conduct, Rome differed from many other cities, meaning the Grecian. And indeed, it was less a wonder than he seems to make it: For Rome, rising on her own foundation, independent on, and unrelated to any other State, and early possessed with the high enthusiasm of distinction and empire, would naturally esteem her tutelary Gods as her own peculiar; and therefore would reject all foreign mixtures. On the contrary, the Grecian States, related to, and dependent on one

another, would more easily admit of an association and combination amongst their national Deities.

Such was the nature of TOLERATION in the Pagan world; and this the wise provision of ancient Policy, while Civil liberty could keep its own. But when now Government began to degenerate, and ALL, preposterously to submit to the will of ONE; when the Magistrate came to have a good, distinct from that of the People; and civil peace was estimated, not by the blessings it produced, but by the degree of subjection it was able to inflict; then the fashionable scheme of Politics began to turn solely on the maintenance of a Tyrant's power: and He having observed, that, though the *toleration* of religion, under the regulations above described, was evidently for the advantage of Society; yet, as those regulations were too apt to be neglected, he thought it best, by an absolute *intolerance*, and a thorough *uniformity*, to cut off all occasions and opportunities of mischief to himself, from private conventicles and conventions.

Agreeably to this system of power, we find Mæcenas, in Dion Cassius *, dissuading Augustus from allowing any *toleration* of religion at all: as, an indulgence in this matter, would indispose men towards the Magistrate, and make them less fond of the civil and religious Constitutions of their country; from whence factions, and confederacies against the State, would unavoidably arise. He concludes his advice against *toleration* in these remarkable words: ΑΠΕΡ ΗΚΙΣΤΑ ΜΟΝΑΡΧΙΑ ΣΥΜΦΕΡΕΙ; "as a thing by no means agreeing with

* Lib. Hist. 52.

"arbitrary

" arbitrary power." And Tacitus informs us*, the usurper followed it. Thus, we see, that the famous declaration of, ONE KING AND ONE RELIGION, is not a new maxim, for which we are indebted to French Politics.

So noble an original had the principle of INTOLERANCE: and so iniquitous are the adversaries of our holy religion, to throw it upon the *Christian Faith*; when it appears to have been the pure offspring of *civil Tyranny*; how well soever it may have been afterwards nursed and fondled by some Fathers of the Church.

Thus have I attempted to give a plain account of the general methods used by ancient Policy to inculcate and support Religion. Were I to speak, as I once intended, of *those* which particular Lawgivers and Magistrates employed for the use of their proper Societies, I should have it in my power to throw great light upon the argument. But this, though the most curious part of all, must be omitted at present, by reason of its length. In the mean time, I presume, more than enough hath been said, even in those places which only shew the Legislator's care for religion in general, to prove the truth of the proposition, *That, in the opinion of ancient policy, the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments was indispensably useful to civil Society:* For having shewn that the doctrine of a future state was an inseparable part of

* Actum et de sacris Ægyptiis Judaicisque pellendis: factumque patrum consultum, ut quatuor millia libertini generis ea superstitione infecta, quis idonea ætas, in insulam Sardiniam veherentur, coercendis illic latrociniis, et si ob gravitatem cœli interissent, vile damnum: ceteri cederent Italia, nisi, certam ante diem profanos ritus exuissent. Tac. Annal. l. II. c. 85.

Pagan religion, and indeed the sole support of it, the proving their care for religion in general, proves their care for this doctrine in particular. Where, it is worth observing, that, though the ancient Lawgivers deviated from truth, and differed from one another, even in the most important points, concerning *property*, *marriage*, *dominion*, *&c.* yet they unanimously agreed in owning the use, and propagating the belief of a future state of rewards and punishments: And what stronger proof would any one desire of the *necessity* of that doctrine to RELIGION and SOCIETY?

We now see the close connexion between *Civil government* and *Religion.* The following observation will still further explain the necessity of this union.

That benevolent spirit of Antiquity, described above, which set their Heroes upon polishing the barbarous manners of their fellow-creatures, and imparting to them the blessings of CIVIL LIFE, as divine as it appears, hath yet been far exceeded by the charity of these later ages, which sends MISSIONARIES into the furthest regions of the east and west, with the inestimable blessing of *the glad tidings of the Gospel.* But nothing is matter of more grief to serious men, than the constant ill success of so charitable an undertaking. Something sure must have been greatly amiss, to defeat a design which all nature conspires to advance. This would be accounted for. *Catholic* (as they call themselves) and *Protestant* Missionaries go promiscuously to either India. The *Catholics* have laboured most in countries civilized; but, giving a commentitious system for the Gospel of Christ, it is no wonder the Pagans should not be greatly disposed to change *old* fables for *new.* And though the *protestant* Missionaries carry the *genuine Gospel* with them

them into America, yet they preach it to Savages, with no better success. The reason seems to be, because they are *Savages*, without Government or Laws; and consequently of very rude, uncultivated minds. Now Christianity, plain and simple as it is, and fitted in its nature for what it was designed by its Author, requires an intellect above that of a mere Savage to understand *. Something then must be previous to it. And what is that something but CIVIL SOCIETY? This is not at all to its dishonour. And if it hath sometimes happened, through the indefatigable labours of these Missionaries, both of the one and the other Communion, that numbers of savage converts have been made, they could never long preserve, or propagate amongst their tribes, the Christianity they had been taught: but their successors have always found the work was to begin anew, and in a little time, nothing left of the others labours to advance upon. And if what we have said in this book be true, *That religion cannot long subsist without the aid of civil government*, we are not to wonder at it: for, from hence, we conclude, they began at the wrong end; and that to make our holy religion rightly understood, much more to propagate and perpetuate it, they should first have taught these Savages the arts of life: from whence (besides the benefit of that previous knowledge abovementioned) would have resulted this further advantage, that men so sensibly obliged, would have given a more favourable attention to their benefactors. As it is, I am afraid, these Savages observing in the Missionaries (and they have sense enough to observe that the Europeans keep many things from them which it

* See note [YY] at the end of this Book.

would

would be useful for them to know) a total disregard of their temporal concerns, would be hardly brought to think the matters pressed upon them of much importance, or the teachers greatly in earnest. The civilizing a barbarous people is in itself a work of such exalted charity, that to see it neglected when a far nobler end than the arts of life may be procured by it, is matter of the utmost astonishment *. But it is partly owing to this, that many of both missions have had too much of that *fanaticism* in their temper, which disposes men to an utter contempt of worldly things: they are therefore so far from preaching up the advantages of Society, and recommending civil Manners, that they are more disposed to throw aside their own; and have recourse to the dried skins and parched corn of the Savages. While others of them, of a colder turn, and lower form of *superstition*, having taken it into their heads, that the vices of improved life would more *indispose* the Indians to the *precepts* of the Gospel, than their present brutality *incapacitates* them from comprehending the *doctrines* of it, have concluded it best, upon the whole, to keep their eyes shut to the advantages of civil life †. But without doubt so fatal a conduct arises chiefly from the false and inhumane policy of the European Colonies, a policy common to every sect and profession, which makes them do all in their power to keep the natives in a savage state; as suspecting that the neighbourhood of a civilized people would be too unfriendly to their private interests. However, this policy, as bad as it is, has yet something less diabolical in it than that other part of COLONY-RELIGION, which robs

* See note [ZZ] at the end of this Book.

† See note [AAA] at the end of this Book.

the

the opposite Continent of so many thousands of our species, for a yearly sacrifice to their great idol, Mammon, THE GOD OF GAIN. These Colonists, indeed, pretend to observe a kind of aversion in the savages to a civilized State. And it is no wonder if they should not be very forward to imitate the manners of their oppressors. But this is not the natural condition of things. Barbarians are never backward to partake of those advantages of civil life which they understand; except where ill usage has given them an abhorrence for their Instructors. The Goths and Vandals in Europe, together with the other benefits of their Conquests, joyfully embraced the Christian Faith: And the Turks in Asia, and other clans of Tartars in China, readily received Religion and Civility from the conquered nations. On the whole, however, I dare venture to foretel, that no great good will ever come of these Missions, till the two projects of *civilizing* and *saving* be joined in one.

As the matter stands at present, the forests of North and South America are good for little but to be made nurseries for PHILOSOPHERS and FREE-THINKERS. The inhabitants, by following simple nature, are already in possession of that blessing, which these illustrious Instructors so vainly wished for at home; namely, the removal of all RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES from the education of their children. A learned voyager, who has been lately on a mathematical mission to the Equator, describes this happy and envied condition in very emphatic terms; which the reader may find below*. What crops of *Free-thinking* may not be

* — J'ai cru reconnoître dans tous [les Indiens Américains, quoique différentes en langues, mœurs, et coûtumes] un même fonds

be expected from so happy a climate! But our *Philosophers* perhaps, on reflection, may think their favourite maxim here pushed a little too far. However, this freedom from religious prejudices, in the purity of its state here, may be of use, in disposing our *Philosophers* to review their favourite *maxim*; and to consider whether they be well founded, in recommending it in that extent in which it is here practised. It is true, a superstitious education is productive of great evils. But what then? If, through these prejudices, the *Omaguas* of the southern continent think it piety, at the birth of their children, to flatten their heads, like a cheese, between two boards, that their faces may resemble their Deity, the *full moon*; Should the ridicule of this custom make it thought absurd in us, to bring up our children in the love of justice, of purity, and benevolence, that they may resemble the God of the Christians, whom we adore? Our *Philosophers* will say,

de charactère. L'insensibilité en fait le base. Je laisse à décider si on la doit honorer du nom d'apathie; ou l'avilir par celui de stupidité. Elle naît sans doute du petit nombre de leurs idées, qui ne s'étend pas au delà de leurs besoins. Gloutons jusqu' à la voracité, quand ils ont de quoi se satisfaire; sobres, quand la necessité les y oblige, jusqu' à se passer de tout, sans paroître rien desirer; pusillanimes et poltrons à l'excès, si l'ivresse ne les transporte pas; ennemis du travail, indifférens à tout motif de gloire, d'honneur, ou de reconnoissance; uniquement occupés de l'objet présent, et toujours déterminés par lui; sans inquiétude pour l'avenir; incapables de prévoyance et de réflexion; se livrant, quand rien ne les gêne, à une joie puerile, qu'ils manifestent par des sauts et des éclats de rire immodérés, sans objet et sans dessein; ils passent leur vie sans penser, et ils vieillissent sans sortir de l'enfance, dont ils conservent tous les défauts——on ne peut voir sans humiliation combien l'homme abandonné à la simple nature, privé d'éducation et de societé, differe peu de la bête. Relation d'un voyage dans l'Amerique meridionale, par M. de la Condamine, p. 51, et seq.

say, So far they are not unwilling to go. What they would have is, that the infant-mind be kept free from the deformed impressions of POSITIVE RELIGION. But they must pardon us if we think, that in such minds, precepts are best enforced by *example*; and that the best example is that of the Deity in his dispensations to mankind, as delivered by *positive religion*.

Was the full definition of *man*, a GOOD PHILOSOPHER, and his only business, speculative truth, something might be said in favour of preserving his mind, a *rasa tabula*, till he was himself able to judge what was fit to be written on it. But as he was sent into the world to make a GOOD CITIZEN, in the observance of all the relations of civil, social, and domestic life; as he was born for practice and not for speculation; I should think that virtues, so necessary for the discharge of those relations, could not be insinuated too soon, or impressed too frequently; even though the consequence might happen to be, the acquiring an obstinate and unconquerable prejudice in favour of RELIGION.

On the whole, then, we see, that the ancient Lawgivers were as much superior to the modern Missionaries in the *execution*, as These are, to Them in the *design*. Those Sages saw plainly that religion and civil policy were inseparable; and therefore they always taught them together. The experience of all ages justified their conduct; and the *truth*, on which they acted, gives us the most transcendent idea of Divine goodness, which hath so closely united our *temporal* to our *spiritual* happiness. The sum

sum of all is this, that whoever would secure CIVIL GOVERNMENT, must support it by the means of RELIGION; and whoever would propagate RELIGION, must perpetuate it by the means of CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

END

OF THE SECOND BOOK.

NOTES

NOTES

APPERTAINING TO

THE FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH

SECTIONS

OF

BOOK II.

P. 29. [D].

PAUL ERNEST JABLONSKI, a learned German Divine, in his book called *Pantheon Ægyptiorum, sive de Diis eorum Commentarius*, having taken it into his head, for some reason or other, to contend that the Ægyptian Gods were not *dead men deified*, thought rightly that this account of the *Mysteries* stood in his way. "Inter omnia argumenta (says he) quibus utuntur viri docti, ad probandum, Ægyptios coluisse homines, post mortem divinis honoribus, donatos illud sine dubio primum meretur locum, quod ex MYSTERIIS Græcorum et ipsorum quoque Ægyptiorum petitum est. Observavit nempe Theologus Anglus præstantissimus, omnique doctrinæ genere cultus, in Mysteriis Græcorum, hanc etiam initiatis doctrinam tradi consuevisse, Deos illos, quos vulgo adorarent omnes, re ipsa mortales extitisse homines, idque testimoniis quibusdam e CICERONE perquam opportune allatis demonstrasse, et extra omnem dubitationis aleam posuisse videtur. He then quotes this passage of the *Tusculan questions*, and the following from the first book, *Of the Nature of the Gods:* and thus

thus proceeds—Cui quidem loco ex priori, lux est accendenda. Jubebantur ergo omnes, initiati Græcorum Mysteriis, credere Deos quos Græcia coleret cunctos, in lucem hanc aliquando editos fuisse, inter homines vixisse et tandem mortem quoque oppetiisse. All this is said with the candour of a true scholar. How unlike to that miserable chicane lately published at home on this question! Where things are denied no less incontestible than that two and two make four. However the learned Doctor *Jablonski* must not desert his System. His first evasion therefore of the force arising from my account of the *Mysteries* is this,—I had represented them as the invention of Legislators; and had shewn that it was the practice of ancient Lawgivers and Philosophers to teach one doctrine openly and another secretly. Having got me at this advantage, Who knows then, says he, Whether these Institutors of the *Mysteries* believed what they taught? But hear him in his own words—" At quæri non immerito potest, fuerintne Legislatores & Conditores Mysteriorum, de eo, quod credere volebant alios, ipsi certo persuasi. Docere nos voluit ingeniosus ille Auctor, qui arcana Mysteriorum Eleusiniorum nobis non sine successu explicare conatus est, Legislatores et Philosophos veteres permulta suis inculcasse, et vehementer commendasse, quæ credebant hominibus fore utilia, etiamsi ea reipsa judicarent esse falsa. *Quid vetat nos credere* ex illorum numero fuisse etiam doctrinam in *Mysteriis* traditam de mortalibus ad honores divinos evectis—*Prolegom.* Sect. xii.—Nay I know of nothing that *hinders us from believing*, but common sense: Which assures us, that if these men practised the method of the *double doctrine*, one set of opinions taught publicly to all, and another secretly to a few select Auditors, in whom

whom they could particularly confide, the opinions *believed* by them were certainly the latter. But he has another evasion, in support of his System. Though the *Grecian Mysteries* taught the human nature of the National Gods, how does it appear that the *Egyptian Mysteries* taught the same? I answer, From the *Grecian Mysteries* being borrowed from the *Egyptian*, and from a thousand testimonies besides; particularly from the famous transaction between Alexander the Great and Leo the Egyptian priest. This the learned Writer considers as a fable; a very ready way of getting rid of difficulties which obstruct our Systems.—He endeavours to prove, that in the accounts which *Minutius Felix* and *Athenagoras* give of this matter, there were some circumstances inconsistent with the avowed history of Alexander: and from thence he concludes — "Ita ad constituendam illam Fabellam, mendaciis merisque figmentis opus erat." Sect. xv. But if this be sufficient to convict the adventure of imposture, the best attested facts of Antiquity will be in danger; such, for instance, as the defeat of Julian's impious purpose to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem; to the true circumstances of which defeat, the Relators of it have added many very fabulous and absurd. However he acknowledges, that if Alexander did write such a Letter to his mother, the Fact will admit no further controversy. But the Letter, he says, was a forgery of some indiscreet Christian Writers, who being notorious Tricksters, and at the same time got into the general Opinion that the *national Gods of the Pagans were dead men*—what then?—"Estne igitur mirum Tenebrionem *nescio quem*, in eorum gratiam talem Alexandri Epistolam confinxisse, eamque postea certatim alios in usum suum convertisse." Sect. xvi.

Falsarys, of whatever time or profession, I suppose never forge but to supply some imaginary or real want. Thus these Christian Falsarys (as this learned writer observes) forged some *Sibylline Oracles* and books of *Hermes Trismegistus*. But why did they so? Because they foolishly imagined the FAITH wanted some support from the Prophecies and doctrines of the Pagans themselves. But with regard to the Opinion, that *their Gods were dead men deified*, the Profane Writings of best Authority were now full. Nothing therefore can be less founded than this suspicion. His next argument against the authenticity of the EPISTLES is indeed a pleasant one. If, says he, the ancient Philosophers had known any thing of this *Epistle*, their eternal disputations concerning the essence, nature and origin of the *Egyptian Gods* must have been at an end. "Si Epistola illa, quam Patres laudant, genuina esset, tum quæstio de essentia, natura, & origine Deorum Ægyptiorum quæ veteres Philosophos tantopere exercuit, sic decisa et penitus finita fuisset, ut nemini amplius dubium superesse potuerit." Sect. xvi.—Did not the ancient Philosophers dispute full as much concerning the essence, nature and origin of the *Grecian Gods?* And yet this learned Writer confesses that the Grecian Mysteries taught that they were *dead men deified*. He must know little of the temper of the ancient Philosophers, who supposes that even an ORACLE, whether without or within the walls of the *Mysteries* (for oracular Responses were given there as well as at Delphi), could stop them in the career of Disputation. Cicero (we know), who is the Representative of them all, did not suffer his knowledge of what the *Eleusinian Mysteries* taught, to debar him from advancing a hundred different tenets and conjectures

conjectures concerning the essence, nature and origin both of the *Egyptian* and *Grecian* GODS.

But, continues the learned Doctor, "none of the profane Writers, Greek or Roman, ever mention this Epistle." "Non certe videmus unquam aliquem ad hoc oraculum confugere, aut ejus vel levissimam mentionem facere; non Varronem—non Ciceronem—non Diodorum Siculum—non Plutarchum"—Sect. xvi. Nothing indeed is more common, yet nothing is more sophistical, than to argue against a fact recorded by one single Ancient, or by one set of Ancients, because we cannot find it in any other. As if we had all Antiquity before us, and did not know that a few fragments only of that rich Cargo remain, of the Wreck of Barbarous Times. Beside, the silence (on this head) in those fragments we have gathered up, may be naturally accounted for. What the *Mysteries* every where taught, was so well known to the Learned, from numerous and authentic testimonies, concerning the *Eleusinian* and others, that it was nothing strange that neither Varro, Cicero, nor Diodorus Siculus should take any particular notice of this EPISTLE. I do not put *Plutarch* into the number of the silent, because the learned Dr. himself is forced to confess that, in the opinion of some learned men, this Ancient hath alluded to the Epistle in question. The words of Plutarch quoted above run thus, *Alexander in his Epistle to his mother says, that there were certain Oracular Mysteries imparted to him, which, on his return, he would communicate to her under the same seal of Secrecy.* Our learned Dr. thinks otherwise: and that what is said, in the *Epistle* quoted by Plutarch, means the response of a *Common Oracle*; while the *Epistle* mentioned by the Christian Writers refers to

what Alexander learnt in the *Mysteries*. "Verum an dices, obsecro, hanc esse Epistolam illam, quam Patres laudant? Sed in hac agebatur de *doctrinis Mysticis Theologiæ Ægyptiorum*, ante non auditis, in illa, Semno tantum est de *divinitionibus et prædictionibus sibi divinitus factis*," &c. Sect. xvi. This slender reasoning, is spun out of his ignorance, that the words, μυήσεως ἀπόῤῥητος, here used by Plutarch, can only signify *Oracles delivered in the celebration of the Mysteries*. The case was this, The Hierophants of the Mysteries had by this time, to invite custom, erected *their* Oracles also, like to those at the other public Shrines of the Gods: Of which, an account is given elsewhere.

P. 30. [E] The words that follow, are, "Quibus "explicatis ad rationemque revocatis, rerum magis "natura cognoscitur, quam Deorum." Which M. Pluche, in his *Histoire du Ciel*, brings to prove, that the purpose of the *Mysteries* was not to explain the nature of the Gods; and translates thus, "Quand "ces mysteres sont expliqués & ramenés à leur vrai "sens, il se trouve que c'est moins la nature des "Dieux, qu'on nous y apprend, que la nature des "choses mêmes, ou des vérités dont nous avons be-"soin." P. 401. Hist. du Ciel, seconde edit. But had he attended to the dispute carried on in the dialogue, from whence these words of Cicero are quoted, he could hardly have thus grossly mistaken the sense of his author. The reader has now the whole passage before him; in which it is said, that Euhemerus taught the nature of the Gods; that they were dead men deified: and in which, it is clearly enough intimated, that the *Eleusinian* and *Samothracian Mysteries* taught the same doctrine. Yet, according to this translator,

translator, Tully immediately adds, that, " when these " *Mysteries* are explained and brought back to their " true sense, it is found, that not so much the nature " of the Gods is taught in them, as the nature of " things, or those truths which our wants require us " to be instructed in." That is, the Mysteries *did*, and they *did not* teach the nature of the Gods. But, it is not for such kind of prate that Cicero has been so long admired. The words, *quibus explicatis, ad rationemque revocatis*, &c. have a quite different meaning. Velleius, the Epicurean, had undertaken to explain the nature of the Gods. Cotta, the Academic, shews, in his answer, that, under pretence of teaching the nature of the Gods, he, Velleius, took away all Religion; just as those did, who said, the notion of the Gods was invented by Politicians, for the use of Society; just as Prodicus Chius did, who said, men made Gods of every thing they found beneficial to them; just as Euhemerus did, who said, they were dead men deified: I forbear (says Cotta) to speak of what is taught in the *Mysteries:* and then follow the words in question: " Quibus explicatis, ad " rationemque revocatis, rerum magis natura cogno- " scitur quam deorum." That is, " If you will " weigh (says Cotta) and consider all these opinions, " so like your own, they will lead you to the know- " ledge, not of the nature of the Gods, which you, " Velleius, proposed to discourse of, but to the na- " ture of things, which is quite another considera- " tion." Or, in clearer terms, it was, he tells us, Velleius's drift to bring men from *Religion* to *Naturalism*. This observation is to the purpose; and shews that Velleius had deviated from his argument. But what M. Pluche makes him say, is to nobody's

purpose but his own. In a word, *quibus explicatis*, &c. relates to all that Cotta had said of the Epicureans—of those who made religion the invention of Statesmen—of Prodicus Chius—of Euhemerus, and of the *Mysteries*. But M. Pluche makes it relate only to the *Mysteries*. It had hardly been worth while to mention this M. Pluche, had it not been evident, that his purpose in this interpretation of Cicero was to disguise the liberty he took of transcribing the general explanation of the MYSTERIES, as delivered in the first edition of this volume, printed in 1738, into the *second* edition (for when he published the *first*, he knew nothing of the matter) of his book, called *Histoire du Ciel*, printed 1741, without the least notice or acknowledgment. But for a further account of this piece of plagiarism, I refer the reader to a discourse, intitled, *Observations sur l'explication que M. l'Abbé Pluche donne des mysteres & de la mythologie des payens dans son Histoire du Ciel*, written with much judgment and solidity, by M. de Silhouette: who has intirely subverted M. Pluche's fanciful system, as well as proved, that he took his idea of the *Mysteries* from the *Divine Legation*. It is in the fifth dissertation of a work, intitled, *Dissertations sur l'union de la religion, de la morale, & de la politique.*

P. 34. [F] *Euscbius* says, Scripture tells us this, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ οἱ ἱεροὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς διδάσκουσι λόγοι. And so indeed it does even in the general tenor of its history. But I am persuaded this learned writer had his eye on some particular passage; probably on the xlvth chapter of *Isaiah*, where the prophet, foretelling the conquests of *Cyrus*, and the exaltation of his Empire, apostrophises the God of *Israel* in this manner: *Verily*

Verily thou art a God THAT HIDEST THYSELF, *O God of* Israel, *the Saviour.* ver. 15. This was said with great propriety of the Creator of all things, the subject of the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, or *Secret*, in all the *Mysteries* throughout the *Gentile* World; and particularly of those of *Mithras*, in that country which was the scene of the prophecy. That this is the true sense of this obscure passage, appears from the following words of the same chapter, where God himself addresseth the Jewish people: *I have not spoken* IN SECRET, IN A DARK PLACE *of the earth: I said not unto the seed of* Jacob, *Seek ye me* IN VAIN. ver. 19. This was said, to shew that he was taught amongst them in a different way from that participation of his Nature to a *few select Gentiles*, in their *Mysteries*; celebrated *in secret, and in dark* subterraneous *places*; which not being done in order to give him glory, by promoting his public and general worship, was done *in vain.* These were the two places (explained by one another) which, I presume, furnished *Eusebius* with his observation, *That for the* Hebrew *people alone was reserved the honour of being initiated into the knowledge of God the Creator of all Things, and of being instructed in the practice of true piety towards him.*—This naturally leads us to the explanation of those oracles of *Apollo*, quoted by *Eusebius* [*Præp. Evang.* l. ix. c. x.] from *Porphyry*; the sense of which neither those ancient writers, nor our Sir *John Marsham*, seem rightly to have understood. The first is in these Words,

Αἰπεινὴ γὰρ ὁδὸς μακάρων, τριχῇά τε πολλὸν,
Χαλκοδέτοις τὰ πρῶτα διοιγομένη πυλεῶσιν.
Ἀτραπιοὶ δὲ ἔασσιν ἀθέσφαλοι ἐγγεγαυῖαι,
Ἃς πρῶτοι μερόπων ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πρῆξιν ἔφυσαν
Οἱ τὸ καλὸν πίνοντες ὕδωρ Νειλώτιδος αἴης.

The Way to the Knowledge of the Divine Nature is extremely rugged, and of difficult Ascent. The Entrance is secured by brazen gates, opening to the adventurer; and the winding roads, to be passed through, impossible to be described. These, to the vast benefit of mankind, were first marked out by the EGYPTIANS.

The second is as follows:

Μοῦνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίαν λάχον ἠδ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι,
Αὐτογένεθλον ἄνακτα σεβαζόμενοι Θεὸν ἁγνῶς.

True wisdom was the lot only of the CHALDEANS *and* HEBREWS, *who worship the Governor of the world, the self-existent Deity, with pure and holy rites.*

Marsham, supposing after *Eusebius*, that the SAME THING was spoken of in both the Oracles, says, *Certe nulla est controversia quin περὶ μοναρχίας, de unius regimine sive de unico Deo, reverens fuerit & rectissima Ebræorum, non item recta Egyptiorum existimatio.* And again,—*Verum Apollo parum sibi constans* [*Canon. Chron.* pp. 255, 256. edit. *Fr.*], because in the one Oracle, the *Egyptians* are said to be the *first*; and in the other, the *Chaldeans* and *Hebrews* the *only* People who knew the true God. But they are very consistent; they treat of DIFFERENT THINGS: The first, of the *Knowledge* of the true God; and the second, of his *public Worship.* This appears by the different terms in which the Oracles are delivered: The *Hebrews*, whom the Oracle calls *Chaldæans*, were well known to be the *only* people who *publicly worshipped* the true God. But the *knowledge* of him being likewise taught, though to *few*, all over the *Gentile* world, and only in the *Mysteries*, and the *Mysteries* coming, as we have shewn, originally

originally from *Egypt*, the Oracle says, that the *Egyptians first taught men the knowledge of the divine Natures.* But that it was in *this way*, his words plainly intimate:

Ἀτραπιτοὶ δὲ ἔασιν ἀθέσφατοι ἐγγεγαυῖαι,

which exactly describe the embarrassed and perplexed condition of the *Initiated* before they came to the participation of this knowledge. But when the same Oracle speaks of the *Hebrews'* knowledge of God, he uses a very different language.

- - - - - - σεβαζόμενοι Θεὸν ἁγνῶς,

evidently respecting the calm and settled state of public worship. I will only observe, that the frights and terrors to which the initiated were exposed, gave birth to all those metaphorical terms of *Difficulty* and *Danger* so constantly employed by the *Greek* writers, whenever they speak of the Communication of the true God.

P. 36. [G] What hath been said will give light to a strange story told by Thucidides, Plutarch, Cornelius Nepos, Justin, and others, of a debauch and night-ramble of Alcibiades, just before his expedition to Syracuse. In which, they say, he revealed to, and acted over with, his companions, the *Mysteries of Ceres:* that he assumed the office of *Hierophant*, and called some of those he initiated Μύσαι, and others, Ἐπόπται: and that, lastly, they broke all the statues of Hermes. These are mentioned by the Historians as distinct actions, and unconnected with one another. But now we see their relation, and how one arose from the other: for Alcibiades having revealed the origin of Polytheism and the

the doctrine of the Unity to his companions, nothing was more natural than for men, heated with wine, to run forth, in a kind of religious fury, and break the statues of their idols. For, what he acted over, was the celebration of the *greater Mysteries*, as appears from Plutarch's calling them the *Mysteries of Ceres*, she presiding in the *greater*, as Proserpine presided in the *lesser*; and from Alcibiades's calling some Ἐπόπται, the name of those who participated of the *greater Mysteries*.

P. 45. [H] A criticism of that very knowing and sagacious writer, Father Simon of the Oratory, will shew the reader how groundless the suspicions of learned men are concerning the genuineness of this Fragment. Father Simon imagines that Porphyry forged the history of Sanchoniatho, under the name of a translation by Philo Byblius; and conjectures that his purpose in so doing was to support Paganism; by taking from it, its *Mythology* and *Allegories*, which the Christian writers perpetually objected to it. "Il se peut faire—pour repondre aux objections "qu'on leur faisoit de toutes parts, sur ce, que leur "Theologie etoit une pure Mythologie—ils remonte-"rent jusques aux tems qui avoient precedé les "allegories & les fictions des sacrificateurs." Bib. Crit. vol. i. p. 140. But this learned man totally mistakes the matter. The Christians objected to vulgar Paganism, that the stories told of their Gods, were *immoral*. To this their Priests and Philosophers replied, that these stories were only *mythologic Allegories*, which veiled all the great truths of *Theology*, *Ethics*, and *Physics*. The Christians said, this could not be; for that the stories of the Gods had a *substantial*

stantial foundation in fact, these Gods being only dead men deified, who, in life, had like passions and infirmities with other mortals. For the truth of which they appealed to such writers as Sanchoniatho, who had given the History both of their mortal and immortal stations and conditions. How then could so acute an adversary as Porphyry, deeply engaged in this controversy, so far mistake the state of the question, and grounds of his defence, as to forge a book in support of his cause, which totally overthrew it?

P. 51. [I] Some modern Critics think, with *Theophilus*, that Euhemerus was rightly charged with ATHEISM; some think, with *Clemens Alex.* that he was not. There is a circumstance in the case, which seems to me decisive, and would incline one to conclude, concerning him, with the generality of the Ancients: it is this, that the earlier policy of the *Mysteries* and the later of the *Philosophers* concurring to think it expedient for the sake of Religion to keep that truth a secret which Euhemerus divulged, He who, by divulging it, overthrew Paganism, and never troubled himself to substitute any other scheme of Public Worship in its room, might fairly be supposed to intend the destruction of Religion in general.

P. 54. [K] The celebrated French Poet, in a late work, intitled, La Philosophie de l'Histoire, c. 37. Des Misteres de Ceres Eleusine, hath done me the honour of giving his Reader an exact abridgement of all that is here said on the subject of the Mysteries: not as collected from the *Divine Legation*, but as the result of his own researches in Antiquity; save that when he speaks of the Sixth Book of Virgil, he says:

says: " De tres savants hommes ont prouvé que le " sixiéme livre de l'Enéide n'est que la peinture de " ce qui se pratiquait dans ces spectacles [des Misteres " de Ceres Eleus.] si secrets & si renommés :" and when he speaks of the unity of the Godhead revealed in these Mysteries he says, " Le savant Eveque War- " burton, quoique *tres injuste dans plusieurs de ses* " *decisions audacieuses*, donne beaucoup de force à " tout ce que *je viens de dire* de la necessité de cacher " le dogme de l'unité," &c.

My *audacious decisions*, I suppose, are nothing else than my unmasking the ignorance and ill faith of those moderns, which he and his Colleague D'Alembert constantly call THE PHILOSOPHERS, meaning thereby all kind of Unbelievers whatsoever.

P. 56. [L] The common reading, in which all the MSS. agree, is, *Quid mihi displiceat*, INNOCENTES *poetæ indicant comici*. Victorius conjectured, that, instead of *innocentes*, Tully wrote IN NOCTURNIS, which is certainly right. By the *poetæ comici*, I suppose, Cicero meant the writers of the NEW COMEDY. The abuses he hints at, as perpetrated in the *Mysteries*, were of a libidinous kind: which occasioned an intrigue proper for the new comedy. And we may see by Fabricius's *Notitia comicorum deperditorum*, *Bibl. Græc.* lib. ii. cap. 22. how frequently the writers of the new comedy laid the scene of their plots in a religious festival or *Mystery*. Plautus, who copied from them, opens the subject of his *Aulularia* in these words,

\- - - - - Senex
Is adolescentis illius est avunculus,
Qui eam stupravit noctu Cereris vigiliis.

P. 56.

P. 56. [M] By *ille* is here meant P. Clodius, the mortal enemy of Cicero. So that his reasoning seems to stand thus—"I allow an exception for the Eleusinian mysteries, on account of their great use to civil life. But yet their celebration in the night is attended with strange inconveniencies, as appears from the comic poets. And had this liberty of celebrating nocturnal rites by men and women promiscuously, as in the Eleusinian *Mysteries*, been practised in Rome, what enormities must we believe such a one as Clodius would have committed, who contrived to violate the nocturnal rites of the GOOD GODDESS, to which only women were admitted?" For that the Grecian *Mysteries* were thus promiscuously celebrated, appears from what Dionysius Halicarnassensis observes of the purity of the early Roman worship; where no nocturnal vigil (says he) was kept promiscuously by men and women, in the celebration of their *Mysteries*.—ἐ διαπαννυχιασμὲς ἐν ἱεροῖς θεῶν, ἀνδρῶν σὺν γυναιξὶν—.

P. 64. [N] After I had thus distinguished, as here, and elsewhere (in my discourse on the Sixth Æneis and on the Golden Ass of Apuleius) the PURE from the CORRUPT *Mysteries*, the reader will be surprised at the following passage of the very learned and candid Chancellor *Mosheim*—" Pererudite non ita pridem, quanquam non tam semper feliciter quam ingeniose, de MYSTERIIS disputavit Wilhelmus Warburtonus libro celeberrimo, 'The Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated.' Censet vir eruditissimus, ad humanarum mentium immortalitatem docendam omnia instituta fuisse MYSTERIA. Dederim, in *nonnullis* religionis illius, quam recta ratio tradit, præcepta inculcata, & publicarum religionum vanitatem patefactam fuisse: *omnium*

omnium vero hanc rationem fuisse, nunquam sibi persuadebit, qui vel BACCHI MYSTERIA *cogitaverit, quæ teste* LIVIO Romani ferre nolebant. *De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M Commentarii.* Cap. i. Sect. 13. not. (***). But as to the pure and uncorrupt *Mysteries* of Bacchus, authorized by the magistrate, the learned Writer might have seen, pag. 4, note (‡), that Celsus expresly affirms, even these taught a future state; which truth his adversary Origen confesses.

P. 66. [O] This short historical deduction of the rise and fall of the *Mysteries* will afford much light to the following passage of St. Paul, speaking of the *leaders* and *instructors* of the Gentile world,—"So "that they are without excuse: because that *when* "*they knew God, they glorified him not as God,* neither "were thankful, but became *vain in their imagina-* "*tions,* and their foolish heart was darkened. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools: "and *changed the glory of the uncorruptible God, into* "*an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds* "*and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.* Where- "fore God gave them up to *uncleanness,* through the "lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own "bodies between themselves: Who changed the "*truth of God into a lie,* and worshipped and *served* "*the creature more than the Creator,* who is blessed "for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up "*unto vile affections,*" *&c. Rom.* i. 20, *& seq.* In these words, the holy apostle evidently condemns the foolish policy of the Gentile sages, who, *when they knew God* (that is, discovered God, as Paul intimates, by the light of nature) yet *glorified him not as God,* by preach-

ing him up to the people; but, carried away, in the *vanity of their imagination*, by a mistaken principle of politics, that a vulgar knowledge of him would be injurious to society, shut up his *glory* in their MYSTERIES, and gave the people, in exchange for an *uncorruptible God, an image made like to corruptible man and birds, &c.* Wherefore God, in punishment for their thus *turning his truth into a lie*, suffered even their *Mysteries*, which they erected (though on these wrong principles) for a school of virtue, to degenerate into an odious sink of vice and immorality; *giving them up unto all uncleanness and vile affections.* That this was the apostle's meaning, appears not only from the general tenor of the passage, but from several particular expressions; as where he speaks of *changing the glory of God to birds, beasts, and creeping things:* for this was the peculiar superstition of Egypt: and Egypt we have shewn to be the first inventress of the *Mysteries.* Again, he says, *they worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator,* παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα. This was strictly true with regard to the MYSTERIES: the CREATOR was there acknowledged by a small and select number of the Participants; but the general and solemn worship even in these celebrations was to their national idols. In the OPEN worship of paganism, either *public* or *particular*, it was not at all true, for there the CREATURE was the sole object of adoration.

P. 66. [P] What hath been said above, shews that M. Le Clerc hath gone into the other extreme of party prejudice, when he contends (*Bibl. Univ.* tom. vi. p. 73.) that the *Mysteries* were not corrupted at all. I can conceive no reason for so violent a paradox, but

as

as it favoured an accusation against the *Fathers*, who have much insisted on the corruption of them—" Les " peres ont dit qu'on commettoit toute sorte d'ordures " dans ces céremonies: mais quoi qu'ils disent, il n'est " pas croiable que toute la Grece, quelque corrumpuë " qu'elle ait éte, ait jamais consenti que les filles & les " femmes se prostituassent dans les mysteres--Mais " quelques auteurs chrétiens n'ont fait aucune difficulté " de dire mille choses peu conformes à la verité, pour " diffamer le paganisme: de peur qu'il n'y eût que les " payens à qui ou pût reprocher leur calomnies." Bibl. Univ. tom. vi. p. 120.

P. 69. [Q] The reader will not be displeased to find here an exact account of this whole matter, extracted from a very curious dissertation of Is. Casaubon, a great and unexceptionable writer, in his Sixteenth Exercitation on the Annals of Baronius.—" Pii patres " quum intelligerent, quo facilius ad veritatis amorem " corruptas superstitione mentes traducerent; & verba " sacrorum illorum quamplurima, in suos usus trans- " tulerunt; & cum doctrinæ veræ capita aliquot sic " tractarunt, tum ritus etiam nonnullos ejusmodi " instituerunt; ut videantur cum Paulo dicere gentibus " voluisse, ἃ ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, ταῦτα καταγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν. " Hinc igitur est, quod sacramenta patres apellarunt " *mysteria*, μυήσεις, τελετὰς, τελειώσεις, ἐποπτείας, sive " ἐποψείας, τελεσήρια; interdum etiam ὄργια, sed rarius: " peculiariter vero eucharistiam τελετῶν τελετήν. Di- " citur etiam antonomastice τὸ μυστήριον, aut numero " multitudinis τὰ μυστήρια. Apud patres passim de " sacra communione leges φρικτὰ μυστήρια vel τὸ " συμπόσιον μυστήριον; Gregorio Magno, *magnum & " pavendum ysterium.* Μυεῖσθαι in veterum monu- " mentis

" mentis sæpe leges pro cœnæ dominicæ fieri parti-
" ceps; μύησιν pro ipsa actione; μύστης est sacerdos,
" qui etiam dicitur ὁ μυσταγωγῶν & ὁ ἱεροτελεστής. In
" liturgiis Græcis & alibi etiam ἡ ἱερὰ τελετὴ, & ἡ κρυφία
" καὶ ἐπίφοβος τελετὴ, est eucharistia. Quemadmodum
" autem gradus quidem in mysteriis paganicis servati
" sunt, sic Dionysius universam τῶν τελετῶν τὴν ἱερουργίαν,
" traditionem sacramentorum distinguit in tres actiones,
" quæ & ritibus & temporibus erant divisæ: prima
" est κάθαρσις, *purgatio*; altera μύησις, *initiatio*; tertia,
" τελείωσις, *consummatio*; quam & ἐποψίαν sæpe no-
" minat. Spem meliorem morientibus attulisse
" mysteria Attica dicebat paulo ante M. Tullius.
" Patres contra, certam salutem & vitam æternam
" Christi mysteria digne percipientibus afferre, con-
" firmabant: qui illa contemnerent, servari non posse:
" finem vero & fructum ultimum sacramentorum
" θέωσιν, *deificationem*, dicere non dubitarunt, quum
" scirent vanarum superstitionum auctores, suis *epoptis*
" eum honorem audere spondere. Passim igitur
" legas apud Patres, τῆς ἱερᾶς μυσταγογίας τέλος εἶναι
" θέωσιν, finem sacramentorum esse, ut qui vera fide
" illa perciperent, in futura vita dii evadant. Athana-
" sius verbo θεοποιεῖσθαι in eam rem est usus; quod
" mox ab eodem explicatur, *participatione spiritus*
" *conjungimur deitati*. De symbolis sacramentorum,
" per quæ divinæ illæ ceremoniæ celebrantur, nihil
" attinet hoc loco dicere; illud vero, quod est & ap-
" pellantur fidei symbolum, diversi est generis, &
" fidelibus tesseræ usum præstat, per quam se mutuo
" agnoscunt, qui pietati sacramento dixerunt; cujus-
" modi tesseras fuisse etiam in paganorum mysteriis
" ostendimus. Formulæ illi in mysteriis peragendis
" usurpatæ, *Procul este profani*, respondet in liturgia

" hæc per diaconos pronuntiari solita; ὅσοι κατηχέμενοι " προέλθετε; vel, ἔξω περιπατεῖτε ὅσοι ἐνεργέμενοι, ὅσοι " ἀμύητοι; *omnes catechumeni, foras discedite, omnes* " *possessi, omnes non initiati.* Noctu ritus multi in " mysteriis peregebantur; noctu etiam initiatio " Christianorum inchoabatur: Gaudentio nominatur " *splendidissima nox vigiliarum.* Quod autem dice- " bamus de silentio in sacris opertaneis servari a " paginis solito, id institutum veteres christiani sic " probarunt, ut religiosa ejus observatione mystas " omnes longe superarint. Quemadmodum igitur " dicit Seneca, sanctiora sacrorum solis initiatis fuisse " nota, & Jamblichus de Philosophia Pythagoreorum " in τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα, quæ efferri non poterant, & τὰ ἔκφορα, " quæ foras efferre jus erat; ita universam doctrinam " christianam veteres distinguebant in τὰ ἔκφορα, id est, " ea quæ enuntiari apud omnes poterant, & τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα " arcana temere non vulganda; τὰ δόγματα, inquit " Basilius, σιωπᾶται· τὰ δὲ κηρύγματα δημωσιεύεται, *dog-* " *mata silentio premuntur; præconia publicantur.* " Chrysostomus, de iis qui baptizantur pro mortuis: " *Cupio quidem perspicue rem dicere; sed propter non* " *initiatos non audeo: hi interpretationem reddunt* " *nobis difficiliorem; dum nos cogunt, aut perspicue* " *non dicere, aut arcana, quæ taceri debent, apud* " *ipsos efferre.* Atque ut ἐξορχεῖσθαι τὰ μυστήρια " dixerunt pagani, de iis qui arcana mysteriorum " evulgabant; ita dixit Dionysius, *Vide ne enunties,* " *aut parum reverenter habeas sancta sanctorum.* " Passim apud Augustinum leges, *Sacramentum quod* " *norunt fideles.* In Johannem tract. xi. autem sic; " *Omnes catechumeni jam credunt in nomine Christi,* " SED JESUS NON SE CREDIT EIS. MOX *Interro-* " *gemus catechumenum, Manducas carnem filii hominis?* " *nescit*

" *nescit quid dicimus.* Iterum, *Nesciunt catechumeni* " *quid accipiant christiani: erubescant ergo quia nes-* " *ciunt.*" But the worst part of the story is still behind, which the concluding words of the quotation will not suffer me to pass over in silence. These Fathers used so strange a language, in speaking of the *last Supper*, that it gave occasion to a corrupt and barbarous Church, in after-times, to ingraft upon it a doctrine more stupendously absurd and blasphemous than ever issued from the mouth of a Pagan Priest. What is further to be lamented in the affair is this, that the Fathers, who so complaisantly suffered themselves to be misled by these *Mysteries*, in their representation of the Christian Faith, would not suffer the *Mysteries* to set them right in the meaning of a term frequently found in the New Testament, and borrowed from those Rites, namely, the very word itself, MYSTERY: which, amongst the men from whom it was taken, did not signify the revealing of a thing incomprehensible to human reason; but the revealing of a thing kept hid, and secreted, which yet, in its nature, was very plain and intelligible.

P. 70. [R] Mr. Le Clerc owns, that Plutarch, Diodorus, and Theodoret, have all said this; yet the better to support his scheme in the interpretation of the history of Ceres, he has thought fit to contradict them; but his reason is very singular:—" C'étoit la " coûtume des payens de dire que des divinitez " étoient les mêmes, lors qu'ils avoient remarqué " quelque legere ressemblance entre elles, *dans la* " *fausse pensée où ils etoient que les plus grands de* " *leurs dieux s'étoient fait connoître dans toute la* " *terre:* au lieu qu'il n'y en avoit aucun que ne fut

" TOPIQUE, c'est à dire particulier à un lieu—On en " trouvera divers exemples dans le petit traité *De la* " *deesse de Syrie.*" *Bibl. univ.* tom. vi. p. 121. It is very true, that the Gods of the Pagans were local deities; but to think the Ancients could be ignorant of this, when it is from the nature and genius of Paganism, as delivered by them, that we come to know it, is a very extraordinary conceit. Indeed the Moderns, possessed with their own ideas, were and are generally unattentive to this truth; and so have committed many errors in their reasonings on the subject. But that principle of the *intercommunity of worship* in ancient paganism (explained in another place) would have the same effect in spreading the worship, as if their Gods were universal and not local; which shews the Ancients not mistaken in the point in question. Yet Mr. Le Clerc, in another place, could see that Astartè was certainly Isis, as Adonis was Osiris; and this, merely from the similitude, or rather, identity of their ceremonies.

P. 70. [S] There is a remarkable passage in Syncellus relating to this subject, which hath been little understood. This Writer speaking, from Africanus, of the very early Egyptian King, Suphis, says, Ἕτος δὲ καὶ ΠΕΡΙΟΠΤΗΣ εἰς θεὸς ἐγένετο καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν συνέγραψε βίβλον, *This King was a Contemplator of the Gods, and wrote a sacred Book.* The Reader may see, by what Sir J. Marsham hath said on this passage [Can. Chron. p. 53.] how much it wants explaining. What increases the difficulty is the contrary account, which Eusebius, in Syncellus, gives of this matter. He says that *this King was a Contemner of the Gods, and that on his repentance he wrote a sacred book*; ὃς καὶ ΥΠΕΡΟΠΤΗΣ εἰς θεὸς γέγονεν,

γέγονεν, ὡς μεθανοήσαντα αὐτὸν τὴν ἱερὰν συγγράψαι βίβλον. These obscure and inconsistent tracts of History can be only explained and reconciled by what is here delivered concerning the *Mysteries* (originally Egyptian) which had for their grand *secrets* or ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ the detection of Polytheism, and the doctrine of the first Cause. I regard therefore this passage of Africanus, as a remarkable piece of history, which conveys to us the memory of the first Institutor of the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ of the *Mysteries*. The term περιοπῆς peculiar to these Rites, and the ἱερὰ βίβλος, the name of that book which was read to the Initiated, very much support this interpretation. To which let me add this further circumstance:—Suphis, according to Marsham, died about forty years after Abraham. The Patriarch without question instructed the idolatrous Egyptians in the knowledge of the true God. Suphis therefore might take advantage of that knowledge (which he found amongst the priests, with whom Abraham, as Damascenus in Eusebius informs us, had many disputes and conferences about Religion) and apply it to this purpose: And then Eusebius's account, that Suphis was *a contemner of the Gods*, will be so far from giving us any trouble to reconcile it to Africanus's, who calls this same Suphis a *Contemplator* of them, that they jointly tend to elucidate the general subject. For if Suphis instituted ἀπόῤῥητα in his *Mysteries*, which exposed and disgraced Polytheism, he certainly would be esteemed, by all those who had heard it, as an ATHEIST or *Contemner of the Gods*; the character given to all who opposed Polytheism, both in the earlier and later times of Paganism. Now Eusebius finding this charged upon Suphis, by the same authority which says he *wrote a sacred Book*, not appre-

hending to what the thing referred, and not conceiving how a *profane* man should be disposed to *write a sacred Book* or a Ritual of Worship, he tried to reconcile matters, by supposing that the Monarch repented of his *impiety* before he wrote his *book*. Lastly, to confirm all that hath been here said, we may observe, that the mode of speech here used concerning Suphis, is the very same which the Egyptian Chroniclers employ when they speak more plainly of the INITIATIONS of their succeeding Kings. Josephus from Manetho, speaking of Amenophis, hath a remarkable passage to this purpose. Φησὶ τοῦτον ἐπιθυμῆσαι Θεῶν γενέσθαι ΘΕΑΤΗΝ, ὥσπερ Ὧρος εἷς τῶν πρὸ αὐτὸν βεβασιλευκότων· ἀνενείκεῖν δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὁμωνύμῳ μὲν αὐτῷ Ἀμενώφει, παιδὸς δὲ Πάπιος ὄντι, θείως δὲ δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέναι φύσεως, κατά τε σοφίαν καὶ προγνωσιν τῶν ἐσομένων· εἰπεῖν ἓν αὐτῷ τοῦτον τὸν ὁμώνυμον, ὅτι δυνήσεται Θεοὺς ΙΔΕΙΝ, εἰ καθαρὰν ἀπό τε λεπρῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μικρῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν χώραν ἅπασαν ποιήσειεν. [*Cont. Apion.* l. i. c. 26.] "He says, that Amenophis *desired* "*to be made a Contemplator* of the Gods, as was "Orus, one of his Predecessors in the Kingdom: and "that he communicated this desire to his namesake "Amenophis, the son of Papis, who, by his wisdom "and prescience of futurity, was understood to have "*participated of the Divine Nature.* His namesake "hereupon told him, that he might have the Privilege "of *seeing the Gods*, if he would *purge* the whole "country from leprous and *unclean* persons." We see plainly that what was here desired by Amenophis, of his namesake, was an INITIATION. This son of Papis appears to have been the HIEROPHANT of the *Mysteries*, and under that character celebrated for his skill in *divining*. The request is enforced by the favour

favour granted to his Predecessor, Orus, as Æneas's request to the Sibyl, that he might visit the infernal Regions, by the example of Orpheus, Hercules, &c.

" Si potuit Manis arcessere conjugis Orpheus," &c.

The proposed adventures are related in the high terms of *seeing the Gods*, and *visiting the infernal Regions*, agreeably to what has been, and will presently be further explained concerning this sublime phraseology, arising partly from the high veneration paid to *initiation* into the *Mysteries*, and partly from the amazement occasioned by the *Shows* and the *Machinery* exhibited in the celebration of them. The *Aspirant* is required by his namesake the *Hierophant*, to purify the land from the *unclean*, in conformity to those previous ceremonies of lustration which we have shewn were to be performed before admission to the *Mysteries*. And now we see of how little avail, to the service of infidelity, that *Parallel* is, which Sir J. Marsham has drawn between all these passages from Africanus and Manatho, and Moses's *Visions of God* at the *Bush* and in the *Mount*.

P. 82. [T] Ulysses, in Homer, mentions both these sorts in the following lines,

Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἴ μ'——
Φήμην τίς μοι φάσθω ἐγειρομένων ἀνθρώπων
Ἔνδοθεν, ἔκ]οσθεν δὲ Διὸς τέρας ἄλλο φανήτω.

The word *omen* in its proper sense signifies *futuræ rei signum, quod ex sermone loquentis capitur*. Tully says, lib. i. *Divin.* " Pythagorei non solum voces " deorum observarunt, sed etiam hominum, quæ vo- " cant omina." This sort of omen was supposed to

depend much upon the will of the person concerned in the event. Hence the phrases *accepit omen, arripuit omen.* This, as we say, was its first and proper signification. It was afterwards applied to *things*, as well as *words*. So Paterculus, speaking of the head of Sulpicius on the rostrum, says it was *velut omen imminentis proscriptionis.* And Suetonius of Augustus: "Auspicia quædam & omina pro certissimis "observabat. Si mane sibi calceus perperam, ac "sinister pro dextero induceretur, ut dirum." It was used still in a larger sense to signify an *augury*, as by Tully, *De Div.* lib. i.

Sic aquilæ clarum firmavit Jupiter *omen.*

And lastly, in the most general sense of all, for a portent or *prodigy* in general, as in the place before us.

P. 91. [U] The Etrusci seem to have had the same custom, in which the public reposed its last confidence. Livy tells us, that in the 444th year of Rome, when the affairs of this people were grown desperate by the repeated defeats of their armies, they had recourse to the *lex sacra*, as their last refuge. Of which the historian gives this succinct and obscure account, —"ad Vadimonis lacum Etrusci *lege sacrata* coacto "exercitu, quum *vir virum legisset*, quantis nunquam "alias ante simul copiis, simul *animis* dimicarunt," &c. lib. ix. The commentators are at a loss for the meaning of this *sacred law*, in raising an army where every soldier was to chuse his fellow. I certainly think it to be the Institution in question: the Etrusci were descended from the Pelasgi, and had afterwards civilized and polished themselves by Grecian customs, as one may well suppose from the character Livy gives of

of them in this book—" Cære educatus apud hospites, " Etruscis inde literis eruditus erat:—habet autores, " vulgo tum Romanos pueros, sicut nunc Græcis, ita " *Etruscis literis* erudiri solitos." But, in general, the giving a traditive original even to the most characteristic customs, is very fallacious. MAHOMET, who certainly did not BORROW from the ancient Grecian practices, yet established the same kind of Fraternity amongst his followers, in the first year of the Hegira. See Abul-feda *De vita Mahommedis*, cap. 26. init. *De Fraternitate instituta inter Moslemos.* And, what is still more extraordinary, the Missionaries assure us, that it is one of the most sacred Institutions amongst the warrior-nations of the free people in North America. Which, because it so exactly resembles the Grecian in all its circumstances, I shall give, as I find it described by one of their best writers. " Chacun " parmi eux a un ami à peu pres de son age, auquel " il s'attache, et qui s'attache à lui par des liens indis- " solubles. Deux hommes ainsi unis pour leur intê- " rêt commun, doivent tout faire & tout risquer pour " s'entr'aider, & se secourir mutuellement: *la mort* " *méme, à ce qu'ils croyent, ne les separe que pour un* " *tems: ils comptent bien de se rejoindre dans l'autre* " *monde pour ne se plus quitter*, persuadés qu'ils y " auront encore besoin l'un de l'autre.—On ajoute, " que ces amis, quand ils se trouvent eloignés les uns " des autres, s'invoquent reciproquement dans les " périls, ou ils se recontrent; ce qu'il faut sans doute " entendre de leurs genies tutélaires. *Les* PRESENS " *sont les noeuds de ces associations*, l'intérêt & le " besoin les fortifient; c'est un secours sur lequel on " peut presque toujours compter. *Quelques uns* " *pretendent qu'ils s'y glisse du desordre*; mais j'ai

" sujet

" sujet de croire qu'au moiens cela n'est pas general." Journal d'un Voyage dans l'Amerique Septentrionale par le P. de Charlevoix, tome vi. p. 14.

P. 93. [X] One can hardly account for that strange mistake of the Abbé Velly, in his elegant History of France, where, speaking of these *fraternities in arms* amongst the *Northern* Nations (for nature dictates the same practice to all, in the same circumstances), he says—" On n'en trouve AUCUN VESTIGE chez ces " fieres Republiques qui s'etoient attribué l'esprit et " la politesse à l'exclusion de tout autre Peuple: " mais elles sont de toute ancienneté chez les Nations " Septentrionales, que la Grece et l'Italie plutôt civi- " lisées ont juge àpropos de nommer Sauvages et " Barbares." Tom. v. p. 58.

P. 98. [Y] Hence the reader will be able to judge of the delicacy of taste, and accuracy of discernment, in a late Writer; who, in a book called *Elements of Criticism*, corrects Virgil's want of judgment in this part of the *Æneis*, after having given instances of defects full as notorious, in the *Georgics*. " An Episode " in a narrative Poem (says this Man of Taste) " being, in effect, an Accessory, demands not that " strict union with the principal subject, which is re- " quisite betwixt a whole and its constituent parts. " The relation, however, of *Principal* and *Accessory* " being pretty intimate, an Episode LOOSELY con- " nected with the principal subject will never be " graceful. I GIVE FOR AN EXAMPLE *the descent* " *of Æneas into Hell*, which employs the Sixth Book " of the Æneid. The Reader IS NOT PREPARED " for this important event. NO CAUSE IS ASSIGNED " that

" that can make it appear NECESSARY, or even natural,
" to suspend, for so long a time, the principal action,"
&c. &c. vol. i. p. 38.—The Critic having told us that *a strict union is not required between the Principal and Accessory*, finds fault with the *Acessory*, that no cause is given to make it appear, that it is NECESSARY to the *Principal*. However, I ought not to be too severe on this great Critic, since the Observation was certainly made on purpose to recommend my interpretation of this *descent into Hell*; which shews, if not the *necessity*, yet the infinite grace and beauty of this noble *Accessory*, and the close and *natural* connexion it has with its *Principal*.

P. 106. [Z] But Servius, in his explanation of the *branch*, went upon the absurd supposition that Æneas's descent into hell was the same with that of Ulysses, in Homer, *a necromantic incantation* by sacrifice, to call up the shadows of the dead. " Ramus enim necesse
" erat, ut & unius causa esset interitus, unde & statim
" mortem subjungit Miseni: & ad sacra Proserpinæ
" accedere, nisi sublato ramo non poterat. Inferos
" autem subire, hoc dicit sacra celebrare Proserpinæ."
And again, ad ver. 149. " *Præterea jacet exanimum
" tibi corpus amici.* Ac si diceret; Est & alia op-
" portunitas descendendi ad inferos, id est, Proserpinæ
" sacra peragendi. Duo enim horum sacrorum genera
" fuisse dicuntur; unum NEKYOMANTIÆ, quod Lu-
" canus exsequitur; & aliud SCIOMANTIÆ, id est,
" divinationis per umbras; σκία enim umbra est, &
" μαντεία, vaticinium, quod in *Homero, quem Virgilius
" sequitur*, lectum est."

P. 107. [AA] The learned Selden, in his comment on the ninth book of *Poly-olbion*, seems to approve the

the absurd conjecture of P. Crinitus, that the *golden-bough* signifies *misletoe:* and would confirm it by that very reason, which absolutely overthrows it; viz. that Virgil COMPARES it to the *misletoe:* for it is contrary to all the rules of good writing, whether simply figurative, or allegoric, to make the *comparison to the cover, the contents of the cover*; a COMPARISON necessarily implying, that the thing, to which another is compared, should be different from that other.

P. 127. [BB] The very learned Mr. Dacier translates ἐν ἀπορρήτοις, *dans les Mysteres*; and this agreeably to his knowledge of Antiquity. For ἀπόρρητα was used by the Ancients, to signify not only the grand secret taught in the *Mysteries*, but the *Mysteries* themselves; as appears from innumerable places in their writings. Yet the celebrated French translator of Puffendorf's *Law of Nature and Nations*, lib. ii. cap. 4. § 19. note (1), accuses him of not understanding his author: "Mr. Dacier fait dire à Platon que *l'on* " *tenoit tous les jours ces discours au peuple dans les* " *ceremonies & dans les Mysteres.* Il seroit à souhaiter " qu'il eût allégué quelque autorité pour etablir un " fait si remarquable. Mais il s'agit ici manifeste- " ment des instructions secrétes que les Pythagoriciens " donnoient à leurs initiez, & lesquelles ils decouvroient " les raisons les plus abstruses, & les plus particuliers " des dogmes de leur philosophie. Ces instructions " cachées s'appelloient ἀπόρρητα—Ce que Platon dit " un peu auparavant de Philolaus, philosophe Pytha- " goricien, ne permit pas de douter que la raison, " qu'il rapporte ici comme trop abstruse & difficile à " comprendre, ne soit celle que donnoient les Py- " thagoriciens." He says, *it were to be wished Dacier*

had some authority for so remarkable a fact. He hath this very passage, which is sufficient; for the word ἀπόῤῥητα can mean no other than the *Mysteries.* But those who want further authority, may have enough of it, in the nature and end of the *Mysteries*, as explained above.—He says, "It is evident, Plato is here talking "of the secret instructions which the Pythagoreans "gave to their Initiated, in which they discovered "their most abstruse and particular doctrines." This cannot be so, for a very plain reason. The philosophy of the Pythagoreans, like that of the other sects, was divided into the *exoteric* and *esoteric*; the *open*, taught to all; and the *secret*, taught to a select number. But the *impiety of suicide* was in the first class, as a doctrine serviceable to society: "Vetatque Pythagoras "injussu imperatoris, id est, Dei, de præsidio & "statione vitæ decedere," says Tully, in his book *Of old age*; who, in his *Dream of Scipio*, written in the *exoteric* way, condemns *suicide* for the very same reason; but in an epistle to a particular friend, which certainly was of the *esoteric* kind, he approves of it; "Ceteri quidem, Pompeius, Lentulus tuus, Scipio, "Afranius, fœde perierunt. At Cato PRÆCLARE. "Jam istuc quidem, cum volemus, licebit." lib. ix. ep. 18. It could not be, therefore, that the impiety of *suicide* should be reckoned amongst the ἀπόῤῥητα of philosophy, since it was one of their *popular* doctrines. But this will be fuller seen, when we come to speak of the philosophers, in the next book. Mr. Barbeyrac concludes, that, "as Plato had spoken of Philolaus a "little before, it cannot be doubted but that he speaks "of the reason against *suicide*, as a doctrine of the "Pythagorean philosophy." What has been said above, utterly excludes this interpretation. But though it

it did not, there is nothing in the context which shews, Plato thought of Philolaus in this place. It is allowed, this was a doctrine of the Pythagoric school, though not of the *esoteric* kind. The *Mysteries*, and that School, held a number of things in common; this has been shewn, in part, already: and when we come to speak of Pythagoras, it will be seen how it happened.

P. 128. [CC] We may well judge it to be so, when we find it amongst the CHINESE (see *M. Polo*, lib. ii. cap. 28.) and the ARABIANS, the two people least corrupted by foreign manners, and the vicious customs of more civilized nations. The Arabians, particularly, living much in a state of nature, where men's wants are few, and consequently where there is small temptation to this unnatural crime, yet were become so prone to it, that their lawgiver Mahomet found it necessary to exact an oath of the Arabian women, not to destroy their children. The form of this oath is given us by Gagnier, in his notes on Abel-feda's *Life of Mahomet*, and it is in these words; "—Ne deo rem ullam asso-" cient; ne furentur; ne fornicentur; NE LIBEROS " SUOS OCCIDANT [metu paupertatis uti habetur, " *Sur* vi. v. 151.] neque inobedientes sint Apostolo " Dei, in eo quod justum est." p. 41. n. (a).

Ibid. [DD] The Egyptian laws were said to have been of Isis's own appointment. This will shew us with what judgment and address Ovid has told the tale of Lidgus the Cretan, in his *Metamorphosis*; (of the nature and art of which Work more will be observed hereafter). Lidgus (in the ixth book, fab. 12.) is represented as commanding his pregnant wife, Telethusa,

Telethusa, to destroy the expected infant, if it proved a female. Yet is this Cretan thus characterized,

- - - vita fidesque
Inculpata fuit - - -

in a word, just such another as Terence's man of universal benevolence, (mentioned above) the Author of the famous maxim, *homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto,* and of the very same command of infanticide to his Wife; who for not obeying it is reckoned by him, amongst those, *qui neque jus neque bonum atque æquum sciunt.* Telethusa, however, as common as such a command was, and as indifferent as it was esteemed, is much alarmed with the apprehension of falling into the cruel situation of being obliged to execute it. In this distress, Isis appears to her in a dream, promises her asisstance, and orders her to deceive her husband, and bring up whatever the Gods should send:

Pone graves curas, mandataque falle mariti;
Nec dubita, cum te partu Lucina levârit,
Tollere quicquid erit - - -

Ovid's moral of his tale is this, "That Egypt had "opposed very wise and humane laws to the horrid "practice of INFANTICIDE, now become general, and "continuing unchecked by all other civil institu-"tions."

P. 177. [EE] On what is here said concerning the Character of Æmilianus the most learned Chancellor Mosheim observes as follows: "Platonicis Christianam Religionem astu subvertere studentibus, APULEIUM non ita pridem addidit vir ingenio æque magnus atque doctrina,

doctrina, *Guil. Warburtonus* in *Demonstratione divinæ Legationis Mosis.* Hunc enim in notissima illa de aureo Asino fabula seu *Metamorphosi* id egisse putat, ut *Mysteria* Deorum summa virtute ad sanandas & purgandas hominum mentes esse prædita, sacrisque Christianis idcirco longe ateferenda, demonstraret, hominem nempe imprimis superstitiosum, Christianisque et publico Sectæ, quam probabat, & privato nomine inimicum. Observavit Vir egregius qua est sagacitate, rerumque veterum peritia, in Apuleio nonnulla nemini ante ipsum observata: in quibus id placet maxime, quod LICINIUM ÆMILIANUM, quid APULEIUM apud Africæ Proconsul *Magiæ* accusaverat CHRISTIANUM fuisse ex *Apologia*, quæ extat, accusati, non sine magna veri specie suspicatur. De consilio vero *Fabulæ de Asino*, quod commentationem *Mysteriorum* et Christianæ Religionis contemtionem vir doctissimus esse conjicit, dubitare mihi liceat, quum nihil afferri videam ex ea, quod difficulter in aliam partem accipi possit." *De rebus Christ. ante Constant. M. Commentarii* Seculum tert. Sect. 21. not. (***). The English of which conclusion amounts to this, " That another interpretation might be given of the *Golden Ass.*" I believe so. It might be shewn to contain a process for the discovery of the *Philosopher's Stone.* And a certain German Chymist, if I be not mistaken, has extracted this secret out of the *Fable.*

P. 277. [FF] These were the considerations, doubtless, which induced the excellent author *De l'esprit des loix* to say, " Il est aisé de regler par des loix ce qu'on doit aux autres; il est difficile d'y comprendre tout ce qu'on se doit à soi-meme." Vol. I. p. 167. 4to.

P. 302.

P. 302. [GG] See Book IV.—Nay, so fond were they of this notion of local tutelary Deities, that they degraded even JUPITER himself, their *Father of gods and men*, into one of them, as appears by his several appellations of *Jupiter Ammon*, *Olympicus*, *Capitolinus*, etc. This deceived Dr. Bentley, who finding *Jupiter*, in the popular theology, to be a local Deity, concluded him not to be *one* but *many*. So that in the last edition of his excellent *Remarks* on that foolish book, called *A discourse of free-thinking*, he reproves the translator of Lucan for calling Jupiter Ammon, *this greatest of the Gods, this mighty chief*:—" A Roman " would never have said that *Juppiter Ammon* was as " great as *Juppiter Capitolinus*; though the translator " took it for granted *that all Juppiters must needs be* " *the same*. But a known passage in Suetonius may " correct his notion of the heathen theology. Augustus " had built a temple to *Juppiter Tonans*, within the " area of the capitol: whereupon he had a dream, that " *Capitolinus Juppiter* complained his worshippers " were drawn away: Augustus, in his dream, an- " swered, that he had dedicated *Tonans* there, only as " the other's porter: and accordingly, when he waked, " he hung (as a porter's badge) that temple round " with bells. Now if *Capitolinus* would not bear the " very *Thunderer* by him, but in quality of his porter; " much less would he have suffered poor beggarly " *Ammon* (for all he was his namesake) to be styled " the *mighty chief*." p. 281. Here he had *one* poet to contradict; who "thought" (he says) " all Jupiters the same." When he wrote his notes on Milton he had *another* on his hands, who, it seems, did not think them to be the same, and he chuses to contradict him, likewise.

" Ammonian Jove, or Capitoline, was seen
" He with Olympias, this with her who bore
" Scipio - - - " Par. Lost, Book ix. 508.

On which, the Critic observes with some contempt—" Then he brings more stories—and (something " strange) TWO Jupiters." However, in his former humour he will have it, that *according to the popular theology*, " all Jupiters were not the same." This will deserve to be considered. The PEOPLE of Antiquity, in excess of folly and flattery, were sometimes wont to worship their good kings and benefactors under the name of *Jupiter*, *the Father of Gods and men*, who, by thus lending his titles, received, in a little time, from posterity, all that worship which was first paid to the borrowers of his name; all their particular benefactors being swallowed up in him. And this was one principal reason of Jupiter's being a *tutelary deity*. But their PHILOSOPHERS, searching into the original of the Pagan theology, found out this lost secret, That their kings had given occasion to the worship of this local tutelary Jupiter; whom, therefore, they regarded, as different Jupiters; that is, as so many kings who had assumed his name. Hence Varro in Tertullian reckons up no less than three hundred. The result of all this was, that in the *popular theology* there was but ONE Jupiter; in the *philosophic theogony* there were MANY. Just as, on the contrary, in the *popular mythology* there were *many* Gods; in the *philosophic physiology*, but *one*.

What shall we say then to the story from Suetonius, which is brought to prove that, according to the popular theology, *all Jupiters were not the same?* For surely the Romans regarded the Capitoline Jupiter

and the Thunderer as the same person: If it be asked, Why then, had they different names? Suetonius will inform us: who relates that Augustus consecrated this temple to Jupiter Tonans, on his being preserved from a dreadful flash of lightning, in his Cantabrian expedition. And so Minucius Felix understood the matter, where he thus addresses the Pagan idolators—Quid ipse JUPITER vester! modo imberbis statuitur, modo barbatus locatur: et cum HAMMON DICITUR, habet cornua; et cum CAPITOLINUS, tunc gerit fulmina. Cap. 21.—And Eusebius, who was perfectly well acquainted with the pagan theology, says expressly, that Ammon was one of the *Surnames* of Jupiter—ἔτι δὲ Δία τὸν ὑπό τινων ΑΜΜΩΝΑ προσαγορευόμενον. *Præp. Evang.* l. iii. c. 3.—And Cicero, in his book of *the nature of the Gods*, makes Cotta take it for granted, that the Capitoline and the Ammonian Jupiter were one and the same; for, speaking of the form and figure of the Gods against Velleius, he says, *Et quidem alia* [species] *nobis Capitolini, alia Afris, Ammonis Jovis:* Where all the weight of the observation consists in the supposition, that the *Capitoline* and *Ammonian* Jupiter were one and the same God. However, this must be confessed, that Capitolinus and Tonans appear to Augustus in a *dream*, as two different persons, and are so considered by him when *awake*. The true solution of the difficulty is this: The Pagans worshipped their Gods under a material visible image. And their Statues, when consecrated, were supposed to be informed by an Intelligence, which the God, to whose worship they were erected, sent into them, as his Vicegerent. This general notion furnished Lucian with a pleasant incident in his *Jupiter Tragicus*, who, calling a grand synod of the Gods, is made to sum-

mon all those of gold, silver, ivory, stone, and copper. Now, in Augustus's dream, it was the *Intelligence*, or Vicegerent, in the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus, who complained of his new brother, in that of Tonans, as getting all the custom from him. This being the whole of the mystery, Jupiter's popular unity remains unshaken.

But what shall we say to the Critic? He censures Rowe, for not saying what Milton had said; and afterwards censures Milton for not saying what Rowe had said; and is yet so unlucky as to be doubly mistaken. The case is this, Where Milton speaks of two Jupiters, he is delivering the sense of the *Philosophers*; where Rowe says there was but one, he is delivering the sense of the *people*; and both were right. But the Critic, being in a contradicting humour, will have both to be in the wrong.

P. 303. [IIII] Denique et antequam commerciis orbis pateret, & antequam gentes ritus suos moresque miscerent, unaquæque natio conditorem suum, aut ducem inclytum, aut reginam pudicam sexu suo fortiorem, aut alicujus muneris vel artis repertorem venerabatur, ut civem bonæ memoriæ. Sic et defunctis præmium, et futuris dabatur exemplum. *Minuc. Fel.* c. xx.—Hence may be seen the falsehood, both in *fact* and *right*, of the foundation principle of the book called——*The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*; that "it was a *common* and *necessary* me-"thod for new Revelations to be built and grounded "on precedent Revelations." Chap. iv. pp. 20, 26.—See this position confuted more at large in the Divine Legation, Book vi. sect. 6.

P. 309.

P. 309. [II] Ils me donnoient cette response assez plaisante; qu'ils ne pretendoient pas que leur Loi fût universelle—qu'ils ne pretendoient point que la nôtre fût fausse;—qu'il se pouvoit faire qu'elle fût bonne pour nous, et que DIEU POUVOIT AVOIR FAIT PLUSIEURS CHEMINS DIFFERENS POUR ALLER AU CIEL; mais ils ne veulent pas entendre que la nôtre étant generale pour toute la terre, la leur ne peut être que fable et que pure invention. *Voyages de Fr. Bernier*, tom. ii. p. 138. Friar William de Rubruquis, a French Minorite, who travelled into Tartary in the year 1253, tells us, c. xliii. that Mangu Chan, Emperor of Tartary, talking to him of religion, said, "As "God hath given unto the hand divers fingers, so he "hath *given many ways to men to come unto him*; "he hath given the Scriptures unto you; but he hath "given unto us soothsayers, and we do that which "they bid us, and we live in peace." The Jesuit Tachard tells us, that the king of Siam made much the same answer to the French embassador, who moved him, in his master's name, to embrace the Christian religion—Je m'etonne que le roy de France mon bon ami s'intresse si fort dans une affaire qui regarde Dieu, où il semble que Dieu même ne prenne aucune interest, et qu'il a entiérement laissé à nôtre discretion. Car ce vray Dieu, qui a créé le ciel et la terre et toutes les creatures qu'on y voit, et qui leur a donné des natures et des inclinations si differentes, ne pouvoit-il pas, s'il eût voulu, en donnant aux hommes des corps et des ames semblables, leur inspirer les mêmes sentimens pour la religion qu'il faloit suivre, et pour le culte qui luy étoit le plus agreable, et faire naître toutes les nations dans une même loy? Cet ordre parmi les hommes et cette unité de religion dependant

absolument de la Providence divine, qui pouvoit aussi aisement introduire dans le monde que la diversité des sectes que s'y sont etablies de tout tems; ne doit on pas croire que *le vray Dieu prend autant de plaisir à estre honoré par des cultes et des ceremonies differentes*, qu'à estre glorifié par une prodigieuse quantité de creatures qui le loüent chacune à sa maniere? Cette beauté et cette varieté que nous admirons dans l'ordre naturelle, seroient elles moins admirables dans l'ordre surnaturel, ou moins dignes de la sagesse de Dieu? *Voyage de Siam*, l. v. pp. 231, 232. Amst. ed. 1688. The Abbé de Choisi, a coadjutor in this embassy, tells us, that the people were in the same way of thinking with their king—Jusques ici ils [les missionnaires] n'ont pas fait grand chose dans le royaume de Siam. Les Siamois sont des esprits doux, qui n'aiment pas à disputer, et qui *croyent la plûpart de toutes les religions sont bonnes*. *Journal du Voyage de Siam*, p. 200. ed. Amst. 1688.

P. 311. [KK] M. Voltaire, in his *Le Siécle de Louis* XIV. having spoken of this persecuting spirit amongst the followers of Christ, and observed that it was unknown to Paganism, says very gravely, that "after having *long searched* for the cause of this difference between the two religions, both of which abounded with dogmatists and fanatics, he at length found it in the REPUBLICAN SPIRIT of the latter."—This was only mistaking the *effect* for the *cause*; and was no great matter in a writer, who in the same place can tell us, not as problematical, but as a known and acknowledged truth, that the JEWS as well as Gentiles offered HUMAN sacrifices.—Cette fureur fut inconnuë au Paganisme. Il couvrit la terre de ténébres, mais

il

il ne l'arrosa guerres que du sang des animaux; et si quelquefois CHEZ LES JUIFS et chez les Païens on *devoua des victimes humaines*, ces devouemens, tout horribles qu'ils étaient, ne causérent point de guerres civiles.—J'AI RECHERCHE LONGTEMS comment et pourquoi cet esprit dogmatique, qui divisa les ecoles de l'antiquité payenne sans causer le moindre trouble, en a produit parmi nous de si horribles.—Ne pourrait-on pas trouver peut-être l'origine de cette nouvelle peste qui a ravagé la terre, DANS L'ESPRIT REPUBLICAIN qui anima les premieres églises? Tom. ii. chap. 32. *Du Calvinisme*, p. 23.—Strange! that he should mistake thus, when he had the true cause almost in view, as he had when he made the following observation: La religion des Païens ne consistait que dans la morale et dans des fetes. And again, in his *Abregé de l'Histoire Universelle*—la raison en est, que les Payens dans leurs erreurs grossiéres *n'avoient point de dogmes*, p. 63.—The first question is, How he came by his observation? That it was no deduction of his own, appears from his not seeing the consequence of the fact contained in it, which was great *indifference* in Religion: for he goes on with that old encomium on Paganism, which our Free-thinkers (who did not see from whence the *indifference* arose) are always ready to give unto it. See p. 164. vol. i. of the Abregé. The second question is, How the Christians came by their *republican spirit?* And this only is worth an answer. Without doubt it was the SPIRIT OF THEIR RELIGION which gave it to them, when the followers of Paganism had it not. Christianity consists in the belief of certain propositions necessary to salvation; which *peculiarity* virtually condemns all other Religions. So that these other having the civil

power on their side, would endeavour to suppress so inhospitable a Novelty. And this directly violating conscience, produced the *Republican spirit*, or the spirit of resistance; whose natural aim goes no further than *Liberty*; not to *Dominion*. Agreeably hereto, as is observed above, the first persecution for Religion was *borne*, not *inflicted*, by the Christian Church.

P. 313. [LL] To this old Pagan blindness, some modern Christians seem to have succeeded. They pretend, that what is said in Scripture of the dependency and foundation of Christianity on Judaism, is said by way of ACCOMMODATION to the prejudices of the Jews; but that when the preachers of the Gospel applied themselves to the Gentiles, they preached up Jesus simply, as a divine Messenger, omitting the Jewish characters of the Messiah. Now, though nothing can be more false, or extravagant; yet the method employed by the first Preachers of the Gospel, to introduce Christianity amongst the Gentiles, gives this foolish Doctrine the little countenance it hath.

P. 313. [MM] This, the Father says on the authority of Tertullian and Eusebius. M. Le Clerc, in his *Hist. Eccl. ann.* xxix. rejects the whole story, though it be as strongly supported as a civil fact can well be. What he urges against it is fully obviated by the principles here delivered. Indeed the chief force of his objection arises from several *false additions* to the fact: A circumstance, which may be found in, and hath been brought to the discredit of, the best attested facts of antiquity; such as the defeat of Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. See my Discourse on that subject.

P. 313.

P. 313. [NN] The not attending to the genius of Paganism, hath misled some of the best Critics into a very lame judgment on the first Apologists; who, they pretend, have unskilfully managed, in employing all their pains to evince what was so easy to be done, the falsehood of Paganism, rather than to prove the truth of their own Religion. For, say these critics, were Paganism proved false, it did not follow that Christianity was true; but were the Christian Religion proved true, it followed that the Pagan was false. But the matter, we see, was just otherwise; and the Apologists acted with much good judgment. The truth of Christianity was acknowledged by the Pagans; they only wanted to have the compliment returned. As this could not be done, there was a necessity to assign the reasons of their refusal. And this gave birth to so many confutations of idolatrous Worship. It is true, when their adversaries found them persist in their *unsociable* pretences, they paid this harsh treatment in kind; and accused Christianity, in its turn, of falsehood: but this was not till afterwards, and then faintly, and only by way of acquit. For want of due reflection on these things, both FABRICIUS and L'ENFANT have been betrayed into this wrong judgment. Facilius subscribo (says the first) judicio viri celeberrimi atque eruditissimi Jacobi L'enfant, in Diario Londiniensi, *Hist. of the Works of the Learned, A.* 1709. p. 284. Il y a long tems, qu'on a eu lieu de remarquer, que la religion Chrétienne est une bonne cause, qui de tout tems a été sujette à être aussi mal defenduë, que mal attaquée. Ses PREMIERS APOLOGISTES la soûtinrent mieux par leur zèle, par leur pieté, et par leurs soufrances, que par les Apologies,

gies, qu'ils nous en ont laissées.—*Delectus argum. et syllabus script. qui relig. Christ. asser.* p. 209.

P. 313. [OO] This was not understood immediately by the Pagans, as appears from a remarkable passage of Lampridius in his life of Alexander Severus—Christo templum facere voluit [Alex. Severus] eumque inter deos recipere—Sed prohibitus est ab iis qui, consulentes sacra, repererant omnes Christianos futuros si id optato evenisset, et templa reliqua deserenda. Now those who rested this conclusion on an oracle, or divine premonition, could have no knowledge of the *nature* of Christianity.

P. 313. [PP] The reader will not be displeased to hear a curious story, from the life of St. Anscharius, which tends much to illustrate what we say, concerning the genius of Paganism, and the reason of its aversion to Christianity. This Saint travelling amongst the people of the North, fell into the following adventure: —Pervenit ad Byrcam, ubi invenit regem et multitudinem populi nimio errore confusam. Instigante enim Diabolo, contigit, eo ipso tempore, ut quidam illo adveniens diceret, se in conventu deorum, *qui ipsam terram possidere credebantur* adfuisse, et ab iis missum, ut hæc regi et populis nuntiaret: Vos, inquiunt, nos vobis propitios diu habuistis, et terram incolatus vestri cum multa abundantia nostro adjutorio in pace et prosperitate longo tempore tenuistis. Vos quoque nobis sacrificia et vota debita persolvistis. At nunc et sacrificia solita subtrahitis, et *vota spontanea segnius offertis*, et, quod magis nobis displicet, *alienum Deum* super vos introducitis. Si itaque nos vobis propitios habere

habere vultis, sacrificia omissa augete, et vota majora persolvite. Alterius quoque Dei cultum, *quæ contraria nobis decetur*, ne apud vos recipiatis, et ejus servitio ne intendatis. Porro si etiam *plures Deos habere desideratis, et vobis non sufficimus, Ericum quondam regem vestrum nos unanimes in collegium nostrum adsciscimus, ut sit unus de numero Deorum.* Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. Sæc. iv. p. 2.—And how little these Pagans doubted of Christianity's being a real Revelation from a God, we may see in another place of the same *Life*, where one of their piratical kings proposes, according to their custom, to enquire by divination what place they should next invade:—Interim rex præfatus eum Danis agere cœpit, ut forte perquirerent, utrum voluntate deorum locus ipse ab eis devastandus esset. Multi, inquit, ibi sunt Dii potentes et magni, ibi etiam olim ecclesia constructa est, et cultura Christi à multis Christianis ibi excolitur, qui *fortissimus est Deorum*, et potest sperantibus in se quomodo vult auxiliari—Quæsitum est igitur sortibus, etc. Cap. xvi.

P. 314. [QQ] The very learned and acute M. Moyle says, *it was the greatest misfortune that could have befallen the Christians to be persecuted by so great and good a man* [M. Antonine.] *Posth. Works*, v. ii. p. 274.—And Lord Shaftesbury observes, *that nothing could have been a greater honour or advantage to Christianity than to be persecuted by a* Nero. Letter con. Enthus. Sect. 3.—We shall know what to think of these observations, when we have considered how the case stood with regard to *persecuting* Emperors. In this class we find, on one side, Nero, Domitian, and the Maximiani; on the other, Trajan, the

the Antonines, and Valerian. Had the *Persecutors* been all like the first set, Unbelievers would have said, "No wonder that force and violence failed to root out the Christian sect, when employed by such Monsters as were hated by Gods and Men." Had the *Persecutors*, on the contrary, been all of the other kind, Unbelievers would then have said, "There must needs have been something very wrong in the Christian practice, or very impudent in the imposture of their pretences, to provoke the sanguinary resentments of Emperors so wise and clement." But now, to see CHRISTIANITY *persecuted* indifferently by the Good and Bad, is sufficient to reduce the enemies of Revelation to silence upon this topic: and is enough to satisfy unprejudiced men, assisted in their judgment by what has been said above, that Providence appeared anxious (as it were) to shew, by this disposition of things, that matters very foreign to the *merits of the case* set this violent machine agoing; whose issue, it was decreed, should convince the World that all it's Power was weakness, when opposed to the progress of the GOSPEL.

P. 315. [RR] St. Paul tells us in what this *hostile odium* consisted, where, speaking of their obstinate adherence to the *Law* against all the conviction of the *Gospel*, he says, *And they pleased not God, and are* CONTRARY TO ALL MEN, 1 *Thess.* ii. 15. They were not *contrary to all men* in their having different Rites; for each nation had rites different from one another: but in their condemning and reprobating all Rites but their own: which being (till the coming of Christianity) peculiar to themselves, was ascribed to their *hatred of mankind.*

P. 316.

P. 316. [SS] τὸ δὲ ἕτοιμον τοῦτο, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως ἔρχηται, μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί. Lib. xi. § 3. But by this *mere obstinacy*, no more possibly might be meant than *a rigid adherence to truth*, which was not one of the distinguishing virtues of this royal Philosopher, as appears even from these *Meditations*. He represents *L. Verus*, his Colleague in the Empire, as a pattern of vigilance, sobriety and decency; and his Wife *Faustina*, as exemplary for her conjugal tenderness and fidelity. Might not then the same STOICAL PRIDE which thought fit to cover Luxury and Lust under the names of Temperance and Chastity, be ready to call the divine Heroism of the Christian Martyrs a *brutal obstinacy?*

P. 319. [TT] St. Chrysostom supposed the Apostle was convened before the Areopagus as a CRIMINAL: and his Authority hath made it the general opinion: From whence, the learned Author of a Tract intitled, *Observations on the Conversion of St. Paul*, hath received it. I would rather think, that the *Philosophers* who *encountered* him, invited him thither as a PUBLIC BENEFACTOR, who had a new Worship to propose to the people. My reasons are these:

1. St. Paul was taken up to this Court by the PHILOSOPHERS. Acts xvii. 19.—But the Philosophers, *of that time*, abhorred the character of delators or persecutors for Religion: this was a temper which sprung up amongst them with the progress of Christianity. The worst opinion they had of Paul was his being a *babbler*, as the Epicureans called him; though the Stoics thought more reverendly of his character, as *a setter forth of strange gods*, ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεύς, a discoverer of some *foreign* Gods; for their hospitality

hospitality extended to all *strangers*, (as Julian tells us) whether *Gods* or *Men*; and this could not but be a welcome office to a people disposed to raise altars even to *Gods unknown*, ver. 23.

2. Their address to him, when they had brought him thither, [*may we know what this doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is*, ver. 19.] implies rather a request to a Teacher, than an interrogatory to a Criminal.

3. At least, the reason they give for their request goes no further than to imply a desire of satisfaction concerning a doubtful matter—*For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears*, ver. 20. ξενίζοντά τινα, *certain foreign ceremonies or customs.* And Strabo, as we see, tells us, the Athenians were most addicted to *foreign worship*.

4. But the very words of the historian fully explain the whole matter; for having told us that these Philosophers *took Paul, and brought him to Areopagus*, he subjoins the motive of their proceeding in these words, —*For all the Athenians, and strangers which were there* [*i.e.* such as resided there for education, or out of love for the Athenian manners] *spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing.* Now had the writer understood the *citation* to be of the criminal *form*, he would have given a more pertinent reason for their conduct; such as jealousy of danger to the State, or the established Religion.

5. St. Paul's speech to the Court hath not the least air of an apology suiting a person *accused*; but is one continued information of an important matter, such as befitted a Teacher or Benefactor to give.

6. Had

6. Had he appeared as a Criminal, the charge against him would have been simply, *The setting forth of strange Gods.* Now this charge of less importance he declines to answer; and yet confesses a much greater crime, of which he was not accused, namely, a condemnation of their established Worship—*And the times of this ignorance God winked at*, etc. ver. 30.

7. The behaviour of the Court towards him shews he was not heard as a Criminal. He is neither acquitted nor condemned: but dismissed as a man, *coram non judice.—And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter*, ver. 32.

8. He left the Court, as one *thus* dismissed.—*So Paul departed from amongst them*, ver. 33. A strange way of intimating a juridical acquittal: but very naturally expressing a resentment for a slighted mission. For as some *mocked*, and others referred him to an indefinite time of audience, nothing was left him but to depart, and, according to his Master's direction, *to shake the dust from off his feet.*

9. The historian's reflection on the whole supports all the foregoing reasons—*Howbeit, certain men clave unto him, and believed*, etc. ver. 34. A very natural conclusion of the story, if only a transaction within the sphere of his Mission; for then, having related its ill success in general, *some mocking, and others putting off the hearing*, he adds, that however it was not altogether without effect, for a few converts he did make, *etc.* But if we suppose it a narrative of a juridical process, we shall not find in it one circumstance of a proper relation. We are not so much as told whether he was acquitted or censured, or gave caution

for

for a new appearance: But, as if so illustrious a prosecution (where the most learned of the Apostles was the *Criminal*, the Greek Philosophers his *Accusers*, and the Court of Areopagus his *Judges)* was below the historian's notice, we are told a thing quite foreign to the matter,--That he made but few converts.

In a word, take this history in the sense here explained, and the whole narrative is simple, exact, and luminous: Take it in the other, and it scarce affords us one single quality of a pertinent relation, but is obscured from one end to the other, both by redundancies and omissions.

But had the interpreters not overlooked a plain fact, they would have given a different sense to this adventure. When Christianity first appeared, its two enemies, the Jews and Gentiles, had long administered their superstitions on very different principles. The Jews employed *persecution*; but the Gentiles gave a free *toleration*. And, though, soon after, the latter went into the *intolerant* measures of the other, yet, at this time, they still adhered to the ancient genius of Paganism. So that, of the many various persecutions of the Christian Teachers, recorded in *The Acts of the Apostles*, there is not one but what was begun and carried on by Jewish Magistrates, or at least excited by their emissaries; if we except that at Philippi, which too was on pretence of an injury to private property. --But the good Father, like more modern Interpreters, was full of the ideas of his own times, when the Persecution of the Christian Faith was far advanced, rather than those of St. Paul, when it was not yet begun. And so I leave it (as it is a mistake) to be obstinately persisted in.

P. 321.

P. 321. [UU] Lib. ii. c. 8. Thus, I think, the words ought to be read and pointed. The common reading is, *separatim nemo habessit deos neve novos: sed ne advenas, nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto:* which is absurd and unintelligible. The manuscript quoted by Manutius reads, *neve novos sive advenas.* In a word, this Law seems not to have been understood by the critics, from their not apprehending the nature of Paganism, and the distinction between their *tolerated* and *established* religions. By the first branch, *separatim nemo habessit deos*, is meant that the Gods in general should not be worshipped in private CONVENTICLES, or be had, as it were, in propriety; (*Suos deos*, says the comment) but lie in common to all the Citizens. And by the second branch, *neve novos, neve advenas, nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto*, is meant that PARTICULARS should not worship any *new* or *foreign* god without licence and authority from the State. For we must remember what hath been said, in the first section of this book, concerning the two parts of Pagan religion; the one public, and the other private; the one which had the *State* for its subject; the other, *particulars.* Now the *State*, as such, worshipped only the country gods; and this was properly the *established religion. Particulars*, as such, frequently grew fond of new and foreign gods, and modes of worship: and these, when allowed by the state, were their *tolerated religions. Privatim* therefore signifies [*by particulars*] not [*privately*], which latter sense would make a contradiction in the sentence: *Nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto:* "Let them not worship them PRIVATELY, "unless they be PUBLICLY allowed." For how could those be said to be *privately* worshipped, that were *publicly* owned? By *deos* NOVOS, both here and in the

comment, I suppose, is meant *gods newly become such:* which in another place he calls—*quasi* NOVOS *et adscriptitios cives in cœlum receptos.—De nat. deor.* l. iii. c. 15. For the *dii minorum gentium* were a kind of every-day manufacture: such as Tully in the words immediately following thus describes: *Ollos quos endo cœlo merita vocaverint*; or, *those who had newly discovered themselves to men.* And by ADVENAS, the *known local gods of other countries.*

P. 322. [XX] Lib. ii. c. 10. Thus I venture to correct the passage. The common editions have it—*Non a sacerdotibus, non a patribus acceptos deos, ita* PLACET *coli, si huic legi* PARUERUNT *ipsi.* Gruter says: Ita me Deus amet, vix intelligo: hæreo, adhuc hæreo.—And none of the critics have pretended to make sense of it, but Petit, in his comment on the Attic laws: De advenis Diis *(says he)* sibi facit objici Tullius, an non liceat acceptos a sacerdotibus aut a patribus alienigenas Deos colere? Respondet Cicero, licere, si, prout hac cavebatur lege, publice sint adsciti, non privata patrum aut sacerdotum auctoritate. Hic igitur verborum Tullii sensus est, qui latet et lectores fugit, qui excidit interrogationis nota, loco suo restituenda et reponenda ad hunc modum. *Suosque deos, aut novos aut alienigenas coli, confusionem habet religionum, et ignotas ceremonias. Non a sacerdotibus, non a patribus acceptos deos? Ita placet coli, si huic legi* PARUERINT *ipsi.* But as plausible as this appears, it cannot, I think, be the true interpretation. Cicero is made to object impertinently: for who, from the words *neve novos, neve advenas, nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto,* could form any suspicion, that, by this law, *the gods received by the priests or their fore-*

fathers

fathers (which certainly had long enjoyed the public allowance) were forbid to be worshipped? And those not publicly allowed, were forbid, from whatever quarter they were brought in. On the other hand, the propriety of the sense, given above, is seen from hence: 1. That the observation is of the nature of an example to a precept. He delivers a *law* concerning the licensing new religions by the Magistrate; and then takes notice that, had it been well observed in Rome, it had prevented a great deal of superstition. 2. The frequent breach of this *law* in Rome was a notorious fact; as appears by the speech of Posthumius in Livy, quoted above; and therefore very likely to be taken notice of by Tully, when he was upon this subject. And what St. Austin says, in his second book of the *City of God*, concerning the actions told of the gods in their public worship at Rome, and the lubricity of that worship, shews the seasonableness of this animadversion. Further, as the general sense of the *law* justifies the emendation in the *Comment*; so the words, *aut novos, aut alienigenas*, in the *Comment*, confirm the correction in the *law*.—By, *confusionem religionum*, I suppose Tully meant, such a confusion of ceremonies, as would leave no distinction between the *established* and the *tolerated* worship; and thereby reduce Religion to so impotent a state, as to render it useless to civil Society: And by, *ignotas ceremonias*, rites, which the Magistrate, by reason of their celebration in private conventicles, could not take cognizance of: which might hurt the morals of society, by their lewdness, as happened in the Bacchanals at Rome; or endanger its peace by cabals and factions, supported and encouraged by the secrecy of their celebration. In the remaining words, Cicero gives a

plain intimation, that, had this law been observed, many superstitions both in the *established* and *tolerated* religions had been avoided; which he hints had been introduced, without warrant from the State, by an interested Priesthood and an ignorant Ancestry. To conclude, the neglect of this law in Rome was very notorious: and, probably, owing to their having no standing judicature, as at Athens, for that purpose.

P. 329. [YY] An intelligent missionary seemed to see where the thing stuck, when he says, Pour ce qui est des conversions, qu'on peut faire de ces gens-là touchant l'Evangile, *on ne sauroit faire aucun fond sur eux.* Ces sauvages, de même que tous ceux de l'Amerique, sont fort peu disposez aux lumieres de la foi, parce qu'ils sont *brutaux et stupides*, et que leurs *mœurs sont extremement corrompues*, et opposées au Christianisme. *Nouvelle Decouv. dans l'Ameriq. Sept. par le R. P. Louis Hennepin Missionaire Recollect et Notaire Apostolique*, à Utr. 1697. p. 221. The corrupt manners of the savages here complained of, as indisposing them to the Gospel, we find, from this writer and others, are of such a kind as arise only from the want of civil government; and which civil government every where rectifies; such as *rapine, cruelty*, and *promiscuous mixtures.* Hans Egede, a Danish missionary, who had been five and twenty years in Greenland, in his description of that country, speaks to the same effect: "It is a matter which can-"not be questioned (says this sensible writer) that, if "you will make a man a Christian out of a mere "savage and wild man, you must first make him "a reasonable man.—It would contribute a great "deal to forward their conversion, if they could, by

" degrees, be brought into a settled way of life." &c. pp. 211, 212.

P. 330. [ZZ] This justice is due to the JESUITS, That they have been wiser in their attempts on PARAGUAY, and on the coast of California; where they have brought the savage inhabitants to a love of agriculture and the mechanic arts. The mission in California was founded at the expence of a certain marquis de Valero; for which the reverend person, whose name was permitted to be put to the Account of *Lord Anson's Voyage round the World*, has suffered the Marquis to be called *a most magnificent Bigot*.

P. 330. [AAA] This is the system of *Charlevoix* in the following passage; which is well worth the reader's notice: After having spoken of the shocking miseries attending the uncivilized condition of the Canadian savages, he goes on thus: Il faut néanmoins convenir que les choses ont un peu changé sur tous ces points, depuis notre arrivée en ce pays; J'en ai même vû chercher à se procurer des commodités, dont ils auront peut-être bientôt de la peine à se passer. Quelques-uns commencerent aussi à prendre un peu plus leurs précautions pour ne pas se trouver au depourvû, quand la chasse leur manquera; et parmi ceux, qui sont domiciliés dans la colonie, il y a bien peu à ajouter pour les faire arriver au point d'avoir un nécessaire raisonnable. Mais qu'il est à craindre que, quand ils en seront là, ils n'aillent *bientôt plus loin, et ne donnent dans un superflu*, qui les rende plus malheureux encore, qu'ils ne sont presentement dans le sein de la plus grand indigence. *Ce ne sera pas au moins les missionnaires, qui les exposerent à ce danger*; persuadés

persuadés qu'il est moralement impossible de bien prendre ce juste milieu, et de s'y borner, ils ont beaucoup mieux aimé partager avec ces peuples ce qu'il y a de penible dans leur maniere de vivre, *que de leur ouvrir les yeux sur les moyens d'y trouver des adoucissemens.* Aussi ceux-mêmes, qui sont tous les jours temoins de leurs souffrances, ont-ils encore bien de la peine à comprendre comment ils y peuvent resister, d'autant plus qu'elles sont sans relâche, et que toutes les saisons ont leurs incommodités particulieres. *Journal Histor. d'un Voyage dans l'Ameriq. Septent.* vol.vi. pp. 57, 58.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

London: Printed by Luke Hansard & Sons,
near Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01129 0055

DATE DUE

[redacted]			
SEP	2 1997		
SEP 2	1997		
OCT 2 5 1997			
NOV 2 4 1997			
DEC 2	1997		
JAN 2 6 1998			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.